CASE STUDY 3

MAN-TROUBLES TALK: 1
TWO HOUSEMATES SHOOT THE BREEZE

As discussed by one of the student researchers:
"Tannen (1990) points to gender differences in trouble-talk, noting that 'women are often frustrated because men do not respond to their troubles by offering matching troubles' (51). She also finds that among males, they do not concentrate on each other person's troubles by 'pursuing, exploring, and elaborating. Instead one talks about his own troubles and dismisses the other's as insignificant' (55). Further, she finds that women are sensitive to matching styles in trouble talk, following up on someone's statements, refraining if the potential recipient does not ask, and using the troubles talk to 'confirm their feelings and create a sense of community' (59), all characteristics of the case of Georgina and Gabrielle (i.e. the two participants in this case study).
More research is needed in the conversational genre of trouble talk, given its ubiquity and therapeutic potential in American culture. Such research must draw on the strengths of sequential analysis, ethnography, and the phenomenological approach used here, with its potential for discovering at both a macro- and micro-analytic level sources of understanding and miscommunication that are both individual and cultural."
I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In the spring of 1994 two students worked on the same conversation between their two housemates, Gabrielle and Georgina. The latter are single women in their early twenties (Gabrielle is 23 and Georgina, 27), who have been sharing a house with the two student researchers since the preceding September. The four of them were strangers before deciding to room together.

As described by one of the Student Researchers, "Gabrielle and Georgina often chat together around the kitchen table late at night after Gabrielle returns from work. The two student researchers rarely enter into their coffee klatches."

As Georgina puts it, we usually run into each other in the kitchen. "Georgina will wander in the kitchen and Gabrielle will respond with 'Hi!' and then the conversation starts." "Sometimes they can go two or three days without seeing each other because of conflicting schedules."

When Gabrielle and Georgina get together, they usually catch up on the day's news, talk about feelings and inevitably talk about relationships.

"Neither had been dating very much. Recently, both met potential boyfriends at about the same time and both have dated the men regularly since then: Ed for Gabrielle and Jack for Georgina. However, the relationships are very much in the early stage with much anxiety about feelings and outcomes, especially given their rocky relationship histories in the past."

As described by Georgina,

"Ga is extrovert in this piece with me because she feels comfortable in the friendship. In general she's more introverted. Ga is more inclined to talk when insecure. I'm just the opposite. I'm more of a thinker. I tend to take on a role of listener. I'm more of a listener than a talker. I tend to gravitate towards people who 'talk' more but who also listen well. I'm curious about what other people have to say. I like taking something in."

"The taped conversation took place on a midweek afternoon, on a rare day that Georgina was not working and prior to Gabrielle's 2 to 11 shift. It lasted around 45 minutes. Neither of the two student researchers was present at the taping."

One of the student researchers worked with Gabrielle as a respondent and the other with Georgina. They used the same specimen, a stretch of around 7 minutes, selected by Gabrielle. In what follows, first Gabrielle's view of the specimen is presented, then Georgina's.
PLACE OF SPECIMEN IN EVENT

There is only one environment: the kitchen of the house in which the roommates live.

BEGINNING: Gabrielle and Georgina wander in the kitchen of their house early in the afternoon

they drink coffee and talk

MIDDLE SPECIMEN

END: they go their separate way
3A: GABRIELLE'S ACCOUNT
GLOBAL LEVEL of INTERPRETATION of TALK
II. VERBAL FLOW STRUCTURE

A: SEGMENTATION OF TALK IN SPECIMEN

1) RESPONDENT'S SEGMENTATION:

In the Blow-by-Blow, as Ga listened to the tape, she gave a discursive commentary of what was taking place that relates more to the Interaction Climate than to the Verbal Flow Structure.
An example is her commentary for lines 1-9:

When Ge and I talk we use these images to
I had given her this image
can you imagine me in this club with my vampire look
so we didn't have to spell it out anymore

This information is presented under Respondent's account, in the analysis of the basic units of the verbal flow structure.

In the Follow-up Interviewing she segmented the Talk in the specimen on the basis on two types of criteria: (1) seven topics with some subtopics; and (2) a combination of two notions, spotlight and focus, spotlight having to do with who has the floor\(^1\), focus having to do with who is being talked about.
This yields a segmentation of the specimen into three major parts, each one having several sections, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I: SPOTLIGHT ON GABRIELLE/FOCUS ON ED (1-76):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Exchange of history (1-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Ga's vampire look (1-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Ga's sweet Catholic girl look (10-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Gabrielle's anxiety over her obsessive talk about Ed (36-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Gabrielle's office mates (48-76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II: SPOTLIGHT ON GEORGINA/FOCUS ON JACK:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4: Georgina's plans to go out with Jack (77-105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Georgina's feelings about Jack (106-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Georgina gets Jack's astrological chart (116-155)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III: SPOTLIGHT ON GABRIELLE/FOCUS ON ED (156-187)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7: Ed's ethnicity (156-187)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

fn1:
The alternation of who has the floor is carefully orchestrated by Gabrielle:
I want to be her friend, build the relationship.
Transcript of Talk segmented and characterized by respondent

I: SPOTLIGHT ON GABRIELLE /FOCUS ON ED
1: Exchange of history:

1.1: Gabrielle's vampire look
Ga (1): It's funny sometimes I dress up in like blue and black
(2): like ya-know the alternative crowd
(3): I look in the mirror
(4): I don't look alternative at all (laughter)
(5): like I just can't/
(6): just doesn't happen
(7): with my face or my hair
Ge (8): yeah
Ga (9): ya-know

1.2: Gabrielle's sweet catholic girl look
Ge (10): you've got that sweet Catholic look there (laughter)
Ga (11): no matter where I go
Ge (12): uh-huh
(13): but that's just cool
(14): sweet Catholic girl alternative (laughter)
(15): rockin' Catholic girl (laughter)
Ga (16): it's totally messed up ya-know
Ge (17): shit!
Ga (18): that's funny I guess
(19): ya-know
Ga (20): I didn't even go to Catholic school
(21): when I say that people go: "really!?" (laughter)
(22): they expect I was raised by nuns or-something
(23): like I'm really not like ya-know/
Ge (24): I used to hate that too
(25): because I kind-a have that same quality
Ga (26): uh-huh
Ge (27): but as I got older
(28): it's better
(29): I'd rather look like that than a rat
(30): ya-know
Ga (31): uh-huh
(32): it's true
Ge (33): not that
(34): ya-know
(35): the only alternative to Catholic is a rat (laughter)

[pause]
2. Gabrielle's anxiety over her obsessive talk about Ed
Ga (36): but I was talking about it last night to like two people at work
(37): and I'm like /
(38): oh
(39): I'm really cursing it now
(40): I'm like/
Ge (41): uh-huh
Ga (42): it's just I kept it/
(43): kept it coming out
(44): I'm just like
(45): "shouldn't talk about it so much"
(46): but
(47): anyway

3. Gabrielle's office mates
Ge (48): what were they saying about it?
Ga (49): they're like "oh it's so cool"
(50): they're like/
(51): and half of them are going to be at the Tropic after work
(52): afterwards
Ge (53): oh really?!
Ga (54): it's going to be really weird
Ge (55): is it that Mike-guy?
Ga (56): yeah
(57): Mike and Angela
(58): I didn't see Mike but Mike'll probably be in to-morrow
(59): but Angela will be there
Ge (60): she's not the one
(61): "hey! I gotta know your business"
Ga (62): (laughter) no
(63): she's not the Latino woman
(64): no
(65): she's the supervisor there but she's just like two years older than me
Ge (66): uh-huh
(67): has she got the attitude or no?
Ga (68): no
(69): she's like totally rebel supervisor
(70): she doesn't really
(71): tell us what to do
(72): one time she's like "come on guys, quiet down!"
(73): we all started laughing
(74): she's behind a little cubicle
(75): she's like; "they're laughing at me" (laughter)
(76): it was funny
II: SPOTLIGHT ON GEORGINA /FOCUS ON JACK

1: Georgina's plans to go out with Jack
Ga (77): so I didn't know you had a new date with uh
Ge (78): Jack
Ga (79): where you gonna go?
Ge (80): uh
   (81): we just left it at/
   (82): well we decided the general place we're gonna go
   (83): we're gonna go meet for a drink
   (84): but then we said/
   (85): we said we'll do an idea generation
   (86): ya-know think about which place
Ga (87): ok
Ge (88): we're just like going to meet minds again on Wednesday
Ga (89): that's great!
   (90): where you gonna meet
   (91): do you know?
   (92): Joe's?
Ge (93): no
   (94): we just have to meet
   (95): that's what we're thinking about
Ga (96): oh ok
Ge (97): that's where we're gonna meet
Ga (98): I thought you were going to meet somewhere and then figure out
   (99): where you're gonna go
Ge (100): uh-huh
   (101): that's the idea
Ga (102): for dinner?
   (103): ya-know?
Ge (104): yeah
Ga (105): and for a little drink and then ...

2: Georgina's feelings about Jack
Ge (106): I don't know Gabrielle
   (107): it's going ok
   (108): he's really easy to talk to
   (109): which is rare
Ga (110): that's cool
Ge (111): for me
   (112): the most/
   (113): I guess/
Ga (114): and I guess
   (115): don't analyze it ya-know

3: Georgina gets Jack's astrological charts
Ge (116): I did the charts
Ga (117): you did!!
Ge (118): kind-of embarrassed to admit it
Ga (119): that's cool (laughter)
Ge (120): but I did the charts
Ga (121): that's cool
Ge (122): they came out really good
   (123): they did
   (124): I'm surprised
Ga (125): wow!
Ge (126): because well
(127): you know a little bit about astrology
(128): right?
Ga (129): yeah
(130): a teeny bit
(131): yeah
Ge (132): he's a Capricorn
Ga (133): oh no
(134): a Capricorn!
Ge (135): Capricorn and Sagittarius
(136): that's always bad
Ga (137): yeah
Ge (138): but my sister is Capricorn and we get along splendidly
Ga (139): uh-huh
Ge (140): but all the other signs
(141): like the moon sign, the ascendent and all that, came out good
Ga (142): that's cool
Ge (143): I-mean it matched up perfectly
Ga (144): that's great
Ge (145): we fell into the best category
Ga (146): so how did you get out of him the date and time of his birth
(147): without/
Ge (148): I told him
(149): "hey I could do your chart" (laughter)
(150): well ya-know he's into that I-Ching stuff
(151): and I said: "I never really explored I-Ching' but
(152): I can do astrology a little bit
(153): very basic astrology
(154): I-mean if you want real astrology
(155): you're going to have to pay somebody"

III: SPOTLIGHT ON GABRIELLE /FOCUS ON ED: ED'S ETHNICITY
Ga (156): well
(157): I know where Ed was born
(158): he was born in Poland
Ge (159): wow!
Ga (160): yeah
Ge(161): you-mean you never got the story about how the Haitian got to Poland?
(162): no
(163): that's what I'm trying to figure out how/
Ge (164): Poland
(165): isn't that one of the iron blocs?
Ga (166): I-mean there were Communists then!
Ge (167): yeah
Ga (168): how could they have met?
Ge (169): wow!
Ga (170): that's what I don't understand
(171): unless
(172): I-mean ya-know if/
(173): if he had a relative in the army but
(174): how could they be in Poland when it was still Communist?
(175): I just don't understand how a Haitian and Polish person could have met
Ge (176): maybe it was really something
(177): really neat like they were diplomats or-something
Ga (178): yeah
   (179): something really funky like that
Ge (180): yeah
Ga (181): I know his dad...
   (182): his parents are really well educated
   (183): something like one has a PhD or-something-like-that
Ge (184): uh-huh
Ga (185): maybe it was something like that
   (186): but definitely something really funky
Ge (187): yeah
(2) ANALYST'S SEGMENTATION: VERBAL FLOW SECTIONS

The systematization of the respondent's segmentation yields candidate basic units, the Verbal Flow Sections. They are ascertained as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINING CRITERIA FOR VERBAL FLOW:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Talk</strong>: SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk</strong>: displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality</strong>: focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEGMENTATION CRITERIA FOR VF SECTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topics and subtopics:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in Part I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Exchange of History (1-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Ga's vampire look (1-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Ga's sweet Catholic girl look (10-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Ga's anxiety over obsessive talk about Ed to her office mates (36-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Ga's office mates (48-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in Part II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Ge's plans to go out with Jack (77-105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Ge's feelings about Jack (106-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Ge gets Jack's astrology chart (116-155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in Part III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: E's ethnicity (156-187)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (3) COMPARISON between A's and R's SEGMENTATION

The analyst's and respondent's segmentation of Talk in the specimen are identical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYST’S</th>
<th>RESPONDENT’S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ga has spotlight/Focus on Ed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Exchange of History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Ga's vampire look (1-9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Ga's sweet Catholic girl look (10-35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Ga’s anxiety over her obsessive talk about E (36-47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Ga's office -mates (48-76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ge has spotlight/Focus on Jack</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Ge’s plans... (77-101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Ge’s feelings (102-115)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Ge getting J’s chart (116-155)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ga has spotlight/Focus on Ed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Ed's ethnicity (156-187)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B: BASIC UNITS: INTERNAL STRUCTURE
and
PARTIAL RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION of
TALK IN CORES

Each VF Section is now examined in turn in order to ascertain how many
basic units it contains. Then, the internal structure of each basic unit, and
the partial rhetorical organization of Talk in their respective cores, are
described in some detail.
VF SECTION (1-9)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Talk:</strong> SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (1-9):**
- **topic:** Exchange of history
- **subtopic:** Ga's vampire look

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (1): It's funny sometimes I dress up in like blue and black
   (2): like ya-know the alternative crowd
   (3): I look in the mirror
   (4): I don't look alternative at all *(laughter)*
   (5): [like I just can't]
   (6): just doesn't happen
   (7): with my face or my hair
Ge (8): yeah
Ga (9): ya-know

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (1-9). It is a RITUAL TELLING, specified by the semantic schema: Ga tells Ge about her vampire look.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF RITUAL TELLING (1-9)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF RITUAL TELLING:

The RITUAL TELLING has a nucleus and 1 satellite.
The nucleus has an entry and a core, both univoxes by Ga.

The satellite is a back channel dyad initiated by Ga, the ongoing speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ga (1): it's funny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE: Ga (1-7)</td>
<td>BACK CHANNEL (dyad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ga (9): ya-know^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ge (8): yeah^2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent's account:

-fn1 checking in
-fn2 affirmation
it means: "go on, I'm listening"
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

Ga telling Ge how she sees herself (in format of narrative)\(^1\)
• 1: narrative set up\(^1\)
• •: introduction:
  (1): sometimes\(^2\) I dress up in like blue and black\(^2\)
  (2): like ya-know\(^3\) the alternative crowd
• •: conclusion:\(^4\)
  (3): I look in the mirror\(^4\)
  (4): I don't look alternative + laughter

• 2: point of the story\(^5\)

**REPAIRABLE:**
(5): [like I just can't]
(6): just doesn't happen
(7): with my face and hair

Respondent's account:

-fn1
this section starts out light
the exchange of history in the beginning is bonding
like we're one person
we found this link
we feel like the same person so we can talk about our insecurities together
you wouldn't hurt yourself
so we won't hurt each other
this is sort of paralleling
and this carries over for me to talk (freely) about Ed (1-9)

-fn1'
autobiographical: a narrative story illustrating how I feel when I try to look alternative (1-4)

-fn2: sometimes
opening of the story
'sometimes' is like 'once upon a time'
it signals a flashback
the key images are 'blue and black'

-fn2'
when Ge and I talk we use these images to/
I had given her this image (=can you imagine me in this club with my vampire look)
so we didn't have to spell it out anymore

-fn3: ya-know
'ya-know' means keeping the connection with Ge
checking in (2)
the key image is 'alternative'
-fn4
conclusion of narrative example (4)
key image is 'mirror'

-fn5
how I feel about it
key images are 'face', 'hair' (7)
VF SECTION (10-35)

(1) RECAPITULATION
   a) Analytic Specification of Section:

   **Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:**
   **Type of Talk:** SHOOTING THE BREEZE
   **Modality of Talk:** displaced
   **Focality:** focal

   **Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (10-35):**
   **topic:** Exchange of history
   **subtopic:** Ga's sweet Catholic girl look

   b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

       Ge (10): you've got that sweet Catholic look there *(laughter)*
       Ga (11): no matter where I go
       Ge (12): uh-huh
       (13): but that's just cool
       (14): sweet Catholic girl alternative *(laughter)*
       (15): rockin' Catholic girl *(laughter)*
       Ga (16): it's totally messed up ya-know
       Ge (17): shit!
       Ga (18): that's funny I guess
       (19): ya-know
       (20): I didn't even go to Catholic school
       (21): when I say that people go "really!? " *(laughter)*
       (22): they expect I was raised by nuns or-something
       (23): like I'm really not like... ya-know
       Ge (24): I used to hate that too
       (25): because I kinda have that same quality
       Ga (26): uh-huh
       Ge (27): but as I got older
       (28): it's better
       (29): I'd rather look like that than a rat
       (30): ya-know
       Ga (31): uh-huh
       (32): it's true
       Ge (33): not that
       (34): ya-know
       (35): the only alternative to Catholic is a rat *(laughter)*

       [pause]
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There are two basic units, as follows:
(1) VF SubStretch (10-17) is a RITUAL INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ge tells Ga that she looks like a sweet Catholic girl.
(2) VF SubStretch (18-35) is a RITUAL BANTER, specified by the semantic schema: Ge tells Ga that she had a similar experience.
(3.1) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF RITUAL INFORMING (10-17)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF RITUAL INFORMING:

The RITUAL INFORMING has a nucleus and one satellite.
The nucleus has only a core, a univox by Ge.
It has an extension, a co-construction dyad initiated by Ga.

The satellite is a univox remark, by Ga.
It has a satellite, a back channel dyad initiated by Ga, the ongoing speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>+ extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE: Ge (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-CONSTRUCTION (dyad)</td>
<td>Ga(11) Ge (12) (13-15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATELLITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REMARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ch (dyad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent's account:

-a kind of checking-in
- affirmation: I know exactly what you are saying
it means that the whole caricature is ridiculous
both the image and my whole life
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

G's elaboration of Ga's image (in format of one-liner)

- **1**: Ge's initial formulation of one-liner: 1'
  
  (10): you've got that sweet Catholic girl look there + laughter

  **CO-CONSTRUCTION**
  
  Ga (11): no matter where I go
  
  Ge (12): uh-huh

  (13): but that's just cool

- **2**: first reformulation of one-liner:
  
  (14): sweet Catholic girl alternative + laughter

- **3**: second reformulation of one-liner: 4
  
  (15): rockin' Catholic girl

  **REMARK**
  
  reinforcement by Ga:
  
  (16): it's totally messed up + laughter

Respondent's account:

-fn1
a 'funny'
sums up my story in a one-liner (a 'funny')
key image is 'sweet Catholic girl' (10)

-fn1'
Ge took the idea and made it even funnier
we're co-creating the image

-fn2
expressing my feeling about the image

-fn3
affirmation

-fn4
exaggerating the image
she has this picture of me in the club and makes it even bigger
exaggerates the funniest parts of it
she's completing the image and exaggerating it even more
this is a quip
she's elaborating on an image
we're co-creating an image

-fn5
the picture is messed up
things don't belong together (her looks and clothing do not go together)
(3.2) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF RITUAL BANTER (18-35)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF RITUAL BANTER:

The RITUAL BANTER has a nucleus and 2 satellites.
The nucleus has an entry and a core.
The entry is a univox cluster by Ga.
The core is a multilogue, a duo initiated by Ge and taken up by Ga, with 1 round.
- The first satellite is a univocal back channel by Ga.
- The second satellite is a back channel dyad initiated by Ge, the ongoing speaker.

**NUCLEUS**

**ENTRY:** Ga (18): that's funny I-guess
  (19): ya-know

**CORE**

**D1:** Ga (18-23)

**D2:** Ge
  (24-25)
  (27-30)
  (33-35)

- **Back Channel**
  Ga (26): uh-huh

- **B.CH. (dyad)**
  Ge (30): ya-know
  Ga (31): uh-huh
  (32): it's true

**Respondent's account:**

- fn1
  in this case 'ya-know' is a filler
  floor holding token
- fn2
  I hear that as: "we both know what I'm talking about"
  I feel glad
- fn3
  abbreviation (shared history)
- fn4
  affirmation (31-32)
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

**D1**: Ga's history (in format of narrative)
- 1: Ga's narrative set-up
  - 1: introduction:
    - (20): I didn't even go to Catholic school
  - 2: conclusion:
    - (21): when I say that people go: "really!? " + laughter
    - (22): they expect I was raised by nuns or-something
- 2: point of story:
  - (23): like I'm really not like … ya-know

**D2**: Ge's history (in format of narrative with one-liner)
- 1: Ge's narrative set-up
  - (24): I used to hate that too
  - (25): because I kind-a have the same quality
  - (27): but as I got older
  - (28): it's better
- 2: point of story:
  - (29): I'd rather look like that than a rat
  - (33): not that
  - (34) you-know
  - (35): the only alternative to Catholic is a rat + laughter

**Respondent's account:**
- fn1 narrative story as an example (autobiographical) (20-23)
- fn2 implied: but I look like I was brought up by nuns
- fn3 mimicking the voice is funny
  key images are 'Catholic school' and 'nuns'
- fn4 how I feel about it
- fn5: ya-know
  'ya-know' abbreviates it
to quicken it up
no need to expand (23)
- fn6 I was never aware of this image (Catholic girl)
  and Ge explained she had a similar image then she reassured me emotionally
  paralleling: I've had that image too
  so we got away from the picture
  now it's sort of a history thing (her own experience)
  so we had this thing in common
  it was very purposeful
she’s been perceived in this way too
so she could reassure me
affirmation
paralleling comes in here
our shared history (that we both are perceived as sweet Catholic girls (lines 24-25)
-fn6-
mini-narrative, personal reference to her past
sort of a history thing
so we got away from the picture
so we had this thing in common
so she could reassure me
-fn7: as I got older
personal reference to her past
sort of a mini-narrative
-fn7'
a one-liner (a ‘funny’)
-fn8
abbreviation: shared history
-fn9
a funny (one-liner)
VF SECTION (36-47)

(1) RECAPITULATION

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focality: focal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (36-47):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topic: Ga’s anxiety over obsessive talk at work about Ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (36): but I was talking about it last night to like two people at work
(37): and [I'm like]
(38): --oh
(39): I'm really cursing it now!--
(40): [I'm like]
Ge (41): uh-huh
Ga (42): it's just I [kept it]
(43): kept it coming out
(44): I'm just like:
(45): "shouldn't talk about it so much"
(46): but
(47): anyway...

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch 36-47).
It is an INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ga expresses her anxiety over her obsessive talk about Ed to her office mates.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (36-47)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:

The INFORMING has a nucleus and one satellite.
The nucleus has an entry, a core, and an exit.
The entry and the exit are univoxes by Ga.
The core is a univox by Ga addressed to Ge.
The satellite is a univocal back channel by Ge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ga (36): but¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE: Ga (36-40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BACK CHANNEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ge (41): uh-huh²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42-45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT: Ga (46): but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47): anyway ...³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent's account:
- fn1
'but' is the moment of suspension
it means a return to what I'm uncomfortable about

- fn2
affirmation
it's significant that she acknowledges what I'm saying and is listening
she simply acknowledged the shift in topic
she knows where I'm coming from and we both agreed

- fn3
I trail off here meaning "we don't need to talk about this if you don't want to"
I don't want to get someone else into my pain
I stop myself here
I'm backing out
I'm getting depressed and anxious and I don't want to burden Ge with my pain
I don't know if she wants to keep talking about this so I pause and see
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

1: Ga's informing (in format of narrative):¹
   ••1: preparation:
     (36): I was ¹ talking about it² last night to like two people at work
     REPAIRABLE:³
     (37: [and I'm like]
     PARENTHESIS
     (38): oh⁴
     (39): I'm cursing it now!
     REPAIRABLE:³
     (40): [I'm like]
   ••2: informing proper: ⁵
     (42): it's just I [kept it]
     (43): kept it coming out
   •2: the point of the narrative:
     (44): I'm just like:
     (45): "shouldn't⁶ talk about it so much"

Respondent's account:
- fn1
  this is the most emotionally charged part of the conversation
  the exchange of history (in the earlier subparts) opens up a comfort space
  now I feel comfortable to talk about Ed again
  because of our shared history and our comfort I don't need a segue here to talk about Ed
  I was talking about Ed
  the order is important
  it's significant that I could jump (to this topic)
  Ge and I were in our intuitive plane
  -that speaks to the larger picture of the conversation
  what we've said in the past--
  there is no connection
  I just jumped
  the Catholic girl was a diversion
  I was feeling insecure about myself
  I was picking on myself
  my ego was satiated
  oh it's not so bad
  I pick on myself
  I was mad at myself once again
  I was afraid I would break the spell (36-47)
- fn1'
  I use the past
  it starts the story
  like at the theatre, curtain goes up
'it' refers to the situation and my feelings
it's all enmeshed
'it' is the whole thing
--it's global--
I experience everything at once
it's almost unnamable because of the way I experience it
it's so much it's indescribable
so I don't name it

I use 'it' because I'm uncomfortable
because I'm talking about Ed when I feel I shouldn't be talking about it
this is a way of backing off

Student Researcher: I notice you don't use Ed's name at all
no
I'm really talking about me and my feelings
I always start with my feelings
the way feelings are blinding
but you feel everything at once
you have so much feeling you're afraid of getting consumed by it

the 'it' still refers to the big 'IT' but also refers to talking about it
so there are several layers: the situation and my feelings about it
my talking about it at work and my worrying that I'm talking about it

-fn3
I'm babbling
I'm obsessing (37-40)

-fn4
'oh' marks speaker involvement

-fn5
now I'm back in the past
I'm getting tongue tied
I can't even articulate it
the 'it' still refers to the big 'IT' but also refers to talking about it
so there are several layers: the situation and my feelings about it

-fn6
'shouldn't' is a paren word
so first I was frustrated because I couldn't say what I mean
and now I'm judging myself for talking about it in the first place (45)
VF SECTION (48-76)
(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:
Type of Talk: SHOOTING THE BREEZE
Modality of Talk: displaced
Focality: focal
Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (48-76):
topic: Ga’s office mates

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ge (48): what were they saying about it?
Ga (49): they're like "oh it's so cool"
   (50): [they're like]
Ga (51) and half of them are going to be at the Tropic after work
   (52): afterwards
Ge (53): oh really?!
Ga (54): it's going to be really weird
Ge (55): is it that Mike-guy?
Ga (56): yeah
   (57): Mike and Angela
   (58): I didn't see Mike but Mike'll probably be in to-morrow
   (59): but Angela will be there
Ge (60): she's not the one
   (61): "hey! I gotta know your business"
Ga (62): (laughter) no
   (63): she's not the Latino woman
   (64): no
   (65): she's the supervisor there but she's just like two years older than me
Ge (66): uh-huh
Ge (67): has she got the attitude or not?
Ga (68): no
   (69): she's like totally rebel supervisor
   (70): she doesn't really
   (71): tell us what to do
   (72): one time she's like "come on guys, quiet down!"
   (73): we all started laughing
   (74): she's behind a little cubicle
   (75): she's like: "they're laughing at me" (laughter)
   (76): it was funny
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (48-76). It is a QUERY, specified by the semantic schema: Ge asks Ga about her office mates’ reaction.
a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:
The QUERY has a nucleus and 2 satellites.
The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by Ge and addressed to Ga, with one exchange.
The first satellite is a univocal back channel by Ge.
The second satellite is an Incidental query.
It has only a core, a dialogue initiated by Ge and addressed to Ga, with 3 exchanges.
The second member of the second exchange has a satellite, a univocal back channel by Ge.
Respondent's account:

-fn1
'oh' marks speaker involvement
surprise
excitement
showing interest
-fn2
affirmation
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

M1: Ge's request for information: ¹
   (48): what were they saying about it?
M2: Ga's response
   .1: response proper:
      (49): they're like: "oh it's cool!" ²

      REPAIRABLE
      (50): [they're like]

   .2: elaboration ³
      (51): and half of them are going to be at the Tropic after work
      (52): afterwards ⁴
      (54): it's going to be really weird

INCIDENTAL QUERY
Ex1: initial use of schema
M1: Ge's question: ⁵
   (55): is it that Mike-guy?

M2: Ga's response
   •1: answer proper ⁶
   ••1: affirmation:
      (56): yeah
   ••2: echoing of question with a correction:
      (57): Mike and Angela
   •2: elaboration (explaining correction):
      (58): I didn't see Mike [but] Mike'll probably be in to-morrow
      (59): but Angela will be there

Ex2: additional use of schema
M1: Ge's request for information (who is Angela?): ⁷
   (60): she's not the one:
   (61): "hey! I gotta know your business!"
M2: Ga's response prope
   •1: first formulation
   ••1: negation
      (62): no + laughter
•2: echoing M1:
   (63): she's not the Latino woman
•2: reformulation
•1: negation:
   (64): no
•2: elaboration (description of Angela)
   (65): she's the supervisor there but she's just like two years older than me

Ex3: additional use of schema
M1: Ge's request for information (what is she like?):
   (67): has she got the attitude or not?
M2: Ga's response:
   •1: answer proper (negation):
      (68): no
   •2: first elaboration (description)
      •1: initial formulation:
         (69): she's like totally rebel supervisor
      •2: reformulation:
         (70): she doesn't really [tell]
         (71): tell us what to do
   •3: second elaboration (illustrative narrative):
      •1: set up
         (72): one time she's like: 'come on guys, quiet down!'
         (73): we started laughing
         (74): she's behind a little cubicle
         (75): she's like: 'they're laughing at me!' +laughter
      •2: punch line
         (76): it was funny

Respondent's account:
- fn1
she validates my feelings and tells me by her question that it's OK to keep talking about it
she takes me back to the beginning (line 36)
she's asking me to think about what other people said
and that triggers a good memory (an upcoming event, lines 51-70)
she took me by surprise that she wanted to keep talking about it
there was a protective quality about it (the question)
Student Researcher: Is it significant that she focused on what others said rather than
on the 'situation' or your feelings?
yes
it begins to shift the mood and gets me to respond to a direct question which I can do after all that babbling
her question snapped me out of my feelings (which were getting more serious and depressed and anxious)
she gives me something concrete to respond to (that's outside of myself) (48)
- fn2
I lighten up the conversation a bit
I mimic the voices of the people at work
that always makes us laugh (49)
- fn3
the opener
I signal an upcoming event
and then from there we start exploring the possibilities of what can happen with these images
key word is 'them'
this is semi-serious
I add some more information and begin to build the image of my co-workers
Ge knows them and can imagine the scene
but the mood could go one way or the other and I'm ready for comic relief (51-52)
- fn4
I'm egging her on: "guess who's going to be there"
this is serious
I feel edgy
but I'm leading her into a 'funny'
this is the comic set up
'weird' is the key word
- fn4'
this is serious
I feel edgy but I'm leading her into a 'funny'
I was still talking more about insecurity there
I was afraid I was breaking some invisible spell by speaking about it
Angela was going to be there
it was making me nervous
I was so tense about it
I didn't want some mystic bubble to be broken
it's hard to describe why that would bother me
if it went poorly I would have to tell everybody how it went and once again I'd have to talk about it
it's like I'm afraid of over analyzing it like I'm doing now
the basic overlying character of my nervousness
it's funny
I need to go back to an image of myself being in the scene again
it's how I experience things cognitively
when I forget things I need to put myself back there
I have photographic images
this is the comic set-up
I need relief
'weird' is the key word
I'm egging her on: "guess who's going to be there?!" (54)
- fn5
a 'funny'
asking for more information
key image is 'Mike-guy'
this is the critical juncture
it's the trajectory to the funny stuff that continues after this
she achieves the lightening up by mentioning Mike and putting it that way: 'Mike-guy'
her choice of words is a sub title funny
here's that imaging thing going on
she could picture Mike
she already knew I was thinking about Mike because of our shared history
it's funny because Mike is funny
she asks 'was it Mike?' to share the image --to probe into the image and I had to share it
-fn6
giving information (I'm the straight man)
key images are 'Mike' and 'Angela' (56-59)

-fn7
trying to get more information
a 'funny'
you can see this took us off on a tangent (60-61)

-fn8
this Latino woman is very tough
she's scary
that's our shared history operating here (63)

-giving information (again I'm the straight man)
there's that imaging again
as soon as I mentioned something connected to work she's already imaging all the things I imagine
intuition and history come in here (65)

-fn9
request for more information (67)

-fn10
-giving information (68-71)

-fn11
personal narrative to illustrate the point
'one time' is like 'once upon a time' (72-75)

-fn12
'one time' is like 'once upon a time'

-fn13
I mimic her voice (72 & 75)
it's funny

-fn14
that's another pattern
when we talk about something serious we need to break it up with something funny --you can hear it in the tone
of our voices-- to break up the tension
our conversation isn't really about our supervisor, it's really about guys
you really don't really need to have a seque
the overall schema is to talk about the two guys
we're both pretty intense people
I know I feel insecure about being intense all the time
I think what I try to do is put in an entertainment value
when I talk about serious things with my friends I at least try to make it funny, sweeten the deal (76)
VF SECTION (77-105)

(1) RECAPITULATION

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Talk: SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality of Talk: displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focality: focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (77-105):**

**topic:** Georgina's plans to go out with Jack

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (77): so I didn't know you had a new date with uh/
Ge (78): Jack
Ga (79): where you gonna go?
Ge (80): uh
   (81): [we just left it at]
   (82): well we decided the general place we're gonna go
   (83): we're gonna go meet for a drink
   (84): but then [we said]
   (85): we said we'll do an idea generation
   (86): ya-know think about which place/
Ga (87): ok
Ge (88): we're just like going to meet minds again on Wednesday
Ga (89): that's great!
Ga (90): where you gonna meet
   (91): do you know?
   (92): Joe's?
Ge (93): no
   (94): we just have to meet
   (95): that's what we're thinking about
Ga (96): oh ok
Ge (97): that's where we're gonna meet
Ga (98): I thought you were going to meet somewhere and then figure out
   (99): where you're gonna go
Ge (100): uh-huh
   (101): that's the idea
Ga (102): for dinner?
   (103): ya-know?
Ge (104): yeah
Ga (105): and for a little drink and then ...
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There are two basic units, as follows:
(1) VF SubStretch (77-89) is a QUERY, specified by the semantic schema: Ga asks Ge where she and Jack are going to go.
(2) VF SubStretch (90-105) is also a QUERY, specified by the semantic schema: Ga asks Ge again where she and Jack are going to go.
(3.1) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (77-89)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has only a nucleus.
The latter has an entry, a core, an exit attempt and an exit.
The entry, the exit attempt and the exit are univoxes by Ga.
The core is a dialogue initiated by Ga and addressed to Ge, with one exchange.
The first member of the exchange has an extension, a univocal co-construction by Ge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS + extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ga (77): so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ga (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80-86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT ATTEMPT: Ga (87): ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT: Ga (89): that's great!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

M1: Ga’s request for information
•1: a preparation:
  (77): I didn’t know you had a new date with uh/

  [CO-CONSTRUCTION]
  Ge (78): Jack

•2: request proper:
  (79): where are you gonna go?

M2: Ge’s response

  [REPAIRABLE:
   (80): [uh]
   (81): [we just left it at]

•1: initial formulation
  initiation:
   (82): well
  development:
   (82): we decided the general place we’re gonna go
   (83): we’re gonna go meet for a drink
   (84): then [we said]
   (85): we said we’ll do an idea generation

  [REPAIRABLE]
  (86): ya-know think about which place

•2: reformulation
  (88) we’re just like going to meet minds again on Wednesday

Respondent’s account:

- fn1
  this is the beginning of serious
  also this is part of sharing the spotlight
  (77-105)
  you can hear it (the tension) in Ge’s voice, she’s a little shy too
  I may be misinterpreting
  that’s burdensome too
  sometimes I’m afraid someone doesn’t want to listen and she’s doing that too --I forget the Freudian word

Student Researcher: projection
yeah
projection
(3.2) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (90-105)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has a nucleus and 2 satellites.
The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by Ga and addressed to Ge, with two exchanges.

The first satellite is a univocal back channel by Ga.
The second satellite is a back channel dyad initiated by Ga, the ongoing speaker.

Analyst's note 1:
'oh' marks speaker involvement
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

Ex1: initial exchange
M1: Ga's request for information
  •1: preparation:
    (90): where you gonna meet
    (91): do you know?
  •2: request proper:
    (92): Joe's?
M2: Ge's response:
  •1: response proper (negation):
    (93): no
  •2: elaboration (explanation):
    (94): we just have to meet
    (95): that's what we're thinking about
    (97): that's where we're gonna meet

Ex2: follow-up use of schema
M1: Ga's presumption:
  (98): I thought you were going to meet somewhere and then figure out
  (99): where you're gonna go

M2: Ge's response (accepting only this part)
  •1: affirmation proper:
    (100): uh-huh
  •2: elaboration:
    (101): that's the idea

  (102): for dinner
  (105): and for a little drink and then…

Analyst's note 1
  very likely Ge means 'why', not 'where'
VF SECTION (106-115)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Talk:</strong> SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (106-115):**

| topic: Georgina's feelings about Jack |

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ge (106): I don't know Gabrielle
      (107): it's going ok
      (108): he's really easy to talk to
      (109): which is rare
Ga (110): that's cool
Ge (111): for me
      (112): [the most]
      (113): [I-guess…]
Ga (114): and I-guess
      (115): don't analyze it ya-know

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (102-115). It is an INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ge expresses her feelings about Jack (102-115).
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (106-115)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:

The INFORMING has a nucleus and 2 satellites.
The nucleus has an entry and a core, both univoxes by Ge addressed to Ga.

The first satellite is a univocal back channel by Ga.

The second satellite is a remark by Ga. It has an entry and a core, both univoxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ge (106): I don't know Gabrielle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE: Ge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK CHANNEL</td>
<td>Ga (110): that's cool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARK</td>
<td>entry: Ga (114): and I guess core: Ga (115)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent's account:

-fn1
trouble talk for Ge:
this is very serious
like this is scary
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

Ge's informing
•1: informing proper
  (107): it's going ok
•2: elaboration (description):
  (108): he's really easy to talk to
  (109): which is rare
  (111): for me

REPAIRABLE:
(112): [the most]
(113): [I guess]

REMARK
advice by Ga:
(115): don't analyze it ya-know
VF SECTION (106-155)
(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

**Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:**
**Type of Talk:** SHOOTING THE BREEZE
**Modality of Talk:** displaced
**Focality:** focal

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (116-155):**
**topic:** Ge gets Jack’s astrological charts

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ge (116):</th>
<th>I did the charts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ga (117):</td>
<td>you did!?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (118):</td>
<td>kind-of embarrassed to admit it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (119):</td>
<td>that's cool (laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (120):</td>
<td>but I did the charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (121):</td>
<td>that's cool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (122):</td>
<td>they came out really good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123):</td>
<td>they did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124):</td>
<td>I'm surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (125):</td>
<td>wow!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (126):</td>
<td>because well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(127):</td>
<td>you know a little bit about astrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(128):</td>
<td>right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (129):</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(130):</td>
<td>a teeny bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(131):</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (132):</td>
<td>he's a Capricorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (133):</td>
<td>oh no!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(134):</td>
<td>a Capricorn!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (135):</td>
<td>Capricorn and Sagittarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(136):</td>
<td>that's always bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (137):</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (138):</td>
<td>but my sister is Capricorn and we get along spendidly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (139):</td>
<td>uh-huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (140):</td>
<td>but all the other signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(141):</td>
<td>like the moon sign, the ascendent and all that, came out good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (142):</td>
<td>that's cool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (143):</td>
<td>I-mean it matched up perfectly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (144):</td>
<td>that's great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (145):</td>
<td>we fell into the best category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (146):</td>
<td>so how did you get out of him the date and time of his birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(147):</td>
<td>without/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (148):</td>
<td>I told him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(149):</td>
<td>“hey I could do your chart” (laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(150):</td>
<td>--well ya-know he’s into that ‘I Ching’ stuff--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(151):</td>
<td>and I said: “I never really explored ‘I Ching’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(152):</td>
<td>but I can do astrology a little bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(153):</td>
<td>very basic astrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(154):</td>
<td>I-mean if you want real astrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(155):</td>
<td>you're going to have to pay somebody”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (116-155). It is an INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ge tells Ga that she did Jack’s astrological charts.

(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (116-155)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:

The INFORMING has a nucleus and 11 satellites. The nucleus has only a core, a univox by Ge addressed to Ga.

The satellites include 9 univocal Back Channels by Ga and 2 Incidental Queries.

The first Incidental Query has an entry and a core. The entry is a univox. The core is a dialogue initiated by Ge, the ongoing speaker, and addressed to Ga, with one exchange.

The second Incidental Query has an entry and a core. The entry is a univox by Ga. The core is a dialogue initiated by Ga and addressed to Ge, with one exchange.
Respondent's account:

- fn1
  when I say "that's cool" I'm being reassuring
  I'm still connected with her emotionally (121)
- fn2
  reassurance (125)
- fn3
  'oh' marks speaker involvement
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

-1: preparation

-1: first formulation:
  (116): I did the charts

-2: reformulation:
  (118): kind-a embarrassed to admit it
  (120): but I did the charts

-2: informing proper:
  (122): they came out really good
  (123): they did

-3: elaboration (restriction)

-1: initiation:
  (124): I'm surprised
  (126): because

INCIDENTAL QUERY
M1: Ge's Request for confirmation
  (127): you know a little bit about astrology
  (128): right?
M2: Ga's Response

-1: affirmative:
  (129): yeah

-2: echoing request in M1:
  (130): a teeny bit

-3: repeat of affirmative
  (131): yeah

..2: development:
  (132): he's a Capricorn

PARENTHESIS
  (135): Capricorn and Sagittarius
  (136): that's always bad
  (138): but my sister is Capricorn and we get along splendidly

  (140): but all the other signs
  (141): like the moon sign, the ascendant and all that, came out good

-4: summary

-1: initial formulation:
  (143): I-mean it matched perfectly

-2: re-reformulation:
  (145): we fell into the best category
INCIDENTAL QUERY
M1: Ga's unfinished request for information: 4
(146): how did you get out of him the date and time of his birth
(147): without/

M2: Ge's response
•1: response proper (reported conversation):
(148): I told him
(149): "hey I could do your chart" + laughter

PARENTHESIS
initiation:
(150): well ya-know
development:
(150): he's into I-Ching stuff 5

(151): and I said: "I never really explored I-Ching
(152): but I can do astrology a little bit
(153): very basic astrology"

•2: elaboration (explanation):
(154): I-mean if you want real astrology
(155): you're going to have to pay somebody"

Respondent's account:
-fn1
I'm even aware of her putting a "funny" in to distract
but I can see she's still nervous about it (116)

'funny'
it will lighten up the conversation but it's still serious
I think the segment is semi-serious because she's hesitant about it (doing the charts) (116)

-fn2
this is where our history comes into play
it's as if we were saying "say no more"
we don't need to express it
she knows my bad history with Capricorns
it's ironic in a way that she's is with a Capricorn
and I can relate to that (132)

fn2'
we're talking about something deep
we're talking about relationships
this segment is serious
again we follow that with something lighter
Capricorn is an unspoken thing in our conversation (=they have spoken before about the subject and don’t need to spell out the subtext)
we're so in tune with each other
she knows what I'm going to say
this is part of the history that smooths things over
making yourself laugh too

a major part of the conversation is to lighten up (133-145)

≠fn3
she’s reassuring herself by thinking of an exception (138)
≠fn4
shift to funny
≠fn5
we change the mood to lighten up
shift to funny
she said 'I Ching' almost like to make fun of him
he'll seem less glamorous
making him less important
another way to ease your fears about a relationship
a way to make someone less of a dream boat even though my interpretation is 'she's making fun of him'
ya-know, you don't want to get hurt (150-151)

(I-Ching or Book of Changes is an ancient Chinese book of wisdom and oracles, 4th millennium BC)
VF SECTION (156-187)

(1) RECAPITULATION

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

**Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:**

**Type of Talk:** SHOOTING THE BREEZE  
**Modality of Talk:** displaced  
**Focality:** focal  

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (156-187):**

**topic:** Ed's ethnicity

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (156): well  
(157): I know where Ed was born  
(158): he was born in Poland  
Ge (159): wow!  
Ga (160): yeah  
Ge (161): you-mean you never got the story about how the Haitian got to Poland?  
Ga (162): no  
(163): that's what I'm trying to figure out how/  
Ge (164): Poland  
(165): isn't that one of the iron blocks?  
Ga (166): I-mean there were Communists then!  
Ge (167): yeah  
Ga (168): how could they have met?  
Ge (169): wow!  
Ga (170): that's what I don't understand  
(171): unless  
(172): I-mean ya-know if/  
(173): if he had a relative in the army  
(174): but how could they be in Poland when it was still Communist?  
(175): I just don't understand how a Haitian and Polish person could have met  
Ge (176): maybe it was really something  
(177): really neat like they were diplomats or-something  
Ga (178): yeah  
(179): something really funky like that  
Ge (180): yeah  
Ga (181): I know his dad...  
(182): his parents are really well educated  
(183): something like one has a PhD or-something-like-that  
Ge (184): uh-huh  
Ga (185): maybe it was something like that  
(186): but definitely something really funky  
Ge (187): yeah
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There are two basic units, as follows:
(1) VF SubStretch (156-160) is an INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ga tells Ge where Ed was born.
(2) VF SubStretch (161-187) is a RITUAL BANTER, specified by the semantic schema: Ga and Ge wonder how Ed's parents met.
(3.1) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (156-160)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:

The INFORMING has a nucleus and one satellite.
The nucleus has an entry and a core.
The entry is a univox by Ga.
The core is a univox by Ga addressed to Ge.

The satellite is a back channel dyad initiated by Ge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ga (156): well</td>
<td>BACK CHANNEL (dyad) Ge(159): wow!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE: Ga (157-158)</td>
<td>Ga(160): yeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent's account:
fn1
shift to serious

b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

G 's informing:
•1: preparation:
  (157): I know where Ed was born
•2: informing proper
  (158): he was born in Poland

Respondent's account:
fn1
it almost got serious when I said: "I know where Ed was born"
I was thinking: would I want to go through and have his chart done and risk being hurt?
the choice is either to obsess and analyze (which is why I'm worried about it which is why I talked about it which is why I'm worried about talking about it) (157)

I'm afraid of astrology because it can doom you to a type of failure
the opening statement doesn't know where it's going to go
it could go in the direction of astrology (which I'm afraid of) or the direction of his strange ethnicity like a tree (157))

Student Researcher (156-187):
*you've used the term 'core' for the obsessional talk about Ed earlier in the conversation is this last segment about Ed's ethnicity also 'core'?*
no
'core' means my fear of talking about it
this could have happened in this segment but Ge drew my attention to something else (line 161)

Student Researcher (157):
*when you said "I know where Ed was born" were you talking to yourself?*
that's hard
I feel like she'd already know
when we get to the core it's like talking to myself and have somebody listen
when I said that I was thinking about what Ge said about astrology
and I was wondering if it would make me feel any better to do Ed's chart
I'm relieved immediately that Ge asks about Poland (161)
my worst fear was that I'd get flustered and the conversation would die and I'd be forced to talk about what I'm really feeling
(3.2) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF RITUAL BANTER  (161-187)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF RITUAL BANTER:
The BANTER has a nucleus and 5 satellites.
The nucleus has an entry and a core. The entry is a univox by Ge.
The core is multilogic, a duo initiated by Ge and taken up by Ga, with two rounds.
The 5 satellites are univocal back channels by Ge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ge (161): you mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENTRY</th>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ge (161)</td>
<td>you mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (162)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (164-165)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (166)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (168)</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(170-175)</td>
<td>wow!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (176-177)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (178-179)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(181-183)</td>
<td>yeah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(185-186)</td>
<td>uh-huh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (180)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (184)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (187)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Channels:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (167): yeah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (169): wow!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (180): yeah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (184): uh-huh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (187): yeah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

Round 1
D1: Ge's formulation of the mystery (in format of a question)
   (161): you never got the story about how the Haitian got to Poland?¹
D2: Ga's answer (negation)
   (162): no

REFRAIN 1 by Ga
   (163): that's what I'm trying to figure out, how?²

Round 2
D1: Ge’s reformulation of mystery:
   (164): Poland
   (165): isn't that one of the iron blocs?³

D2: Ga's contribution
•1: reformulation of mystery
   (166): there were Communists then!
   (168) how could they have met?⁴

REFRAIN 1 by Ga
   (170): that's what I don't understand

•2: hypothetical solution:
   (172): unless ya-know
   (173): I-mean if he had a relative in the army

REFRAIN 1 by Ga
   initiation:
   (174): but
   development:
   (184): how could they be in Poland when it was still Communist?
   (175): I just don't understand how a Haitian and Polish person could have met

Round 3
D1: Ge’s reformulation of solution
   (176): maybe it was (really) something
   (177): really neat like they were diplomats or-something

D2: Ga’s support of Ge’s hypothesis
REFRAIN 2 by Ga

initiation:
(178): yeah
development:
(179): something really funky like that

-1: preparation of support:
(181): I know his dad...

-2: support proper:
(182): his parents are really well educated
(183): something like one has a PhD or-something-like-that

REFRAIN 2 by Ga
(185): maybe it was something like that
(186): but definitely something really funky

Respondent’s account:
-fn1
funny insert (161)

it narrows the topic
I've gotten away from astrology
she makes it branch off her 'funny'
makes it clear it's a diversion
like a stand-up comedian
two images of the Haitian and Poland in the cartoon bubble
-fn2
half serious
plain old inquisitiveness
this is a question or at least a statement that is left unfinished
I'm relieved that the conversation has been determined and it's a safe topic further away from the core (163)
-fn3
another lightener and I allow it to remain light
but more than mood here is my being inquisitive

Student Researcher (166-168): was Ge's question about Poland a set up?
I am uncomfortable so I continue the topic (about Poland)
I'm allowing myself to get completely diverted

we're still questioning
we both have separate questions
two issues
mine is how did they meet?
hers is about the iron block
the two are related
we're both on a different wavelength for a second (164-165)
I meld the two questions: how could they meet when it was Communist? (166-168)

**Student Researcher:** *why do you meld the two questions together?*

because it feels like we're together but apart

I make a mutual territory of inquisitiveness

**Student Researcher:** *so then it becomes a joint project?*

it does from that point on (166-170)

---

it's sort of edging outside the topic

a kind of distancing from my thoughts

I can't really solve it (Ed's ethnicity)

**Student Researcher:** *why do lines 176-177 belong with this?*

well I guess you could/

it takes my idea and gives it another scenario: her imagining of it

---

trailing off : we can talk about something else (181)

---

I bring it back to something concrete (183)+(185-186)

**Student Researcher:** *why did you wait so long to say something concrete?*

**Respondent:**

because I wanted to let it go off in different directions

I start editing myself

I've taken so long

closure for me, spotlight for her
III. INTERACTION CLIMATE

I. INTERACTIVE MODE
(1) STRATEGIES

Gabrielle views her interaction with Georgina as fulfilling two goals: (1) reducing her anxiety in order for her to be able to talk about difficult matters, and (2) building a relationship with Georgina. This comes out clearly in Gabrielle's comments:

we can talk about what's bothering us
what we're thinking about,
get feedback

Student Researcher: what else goes on in a conversation?

Respondent:
I show her I want to be her friend
build a relationship

The Student Researcher describes the two goals as follows: "Ga is preoccupied with her anxiety around her relationship with Ed. The problem is not so much Ed, or her feelings around him, but her tendency to obsess about her feelings and to talk compulsively about her anxieties to outsiders, such as people at work. She wants to talk about Ed, because relationships are exciting, but she also wants to reduce the anxiety generated around her obsessional talk. As explained by the respondent:

it's like I'm afraid of overanalyzing it like I'm doing now
the basic overlying character of my nervousness

the choice is either to obsess and analyze
which is why I'm worried about it
which is why I talked about it
which is why I'm worried about talking about it

Thus, the project in this conversation is manage her anxiety in such a way as to get relief through their friendly caring relationship. It is this caring and perfect understanding which Ga must confirm and preserve as the conversation proceeds."

The link between the two goals is that anxiety reduction is only possible because of the friendship between the two young women. Ga works at both reducing her anxiety and protecting her friendship. She has three strategies to meet these two goals:
two for anxiety reduction: lightening up the conversation, and bonding;
one for protecting her relationship with Ge: watching over the friendship.
STRATEGIES FOR ANXIETY REDUCTION

The two anxiety reduction strategies are used to create a comfort zone that allows Ga—and Ge as understood by Ga—to talk about a core topic, i.e., a topic they are afraid of, or reluctant to talk about. Ga's core topic is her relationship with Ed. Ge's core topic is her relationship with Jack:

we need comfort to talk about what's bothering us
this carries over for me to talk about Ed
she can make me feel better

As discussed by the Student Researcher "this is a therapeutic environment—a comfort zone around the kitchen table in which she (=Ga) feels free to speak—which she and Ge can co-create."

This comfort zone Ga calls a conversational bubble. The Student Researcher explains this notion as follows:
"The bubble metaphor is an image of the elasticity of conversational contours: They can have a basic core but the conversation is not restricted to it; each partner can push the boundaries out way from this core to a greater or lesser extent."

The Lightening up Strategy:
The comfort zone is created through two types of talk that offer a diversion from a core topic. They are (1) safe talk and (2) funny talk.

An example of Safe Talk is Ed's Polish background.

As noted by Ga a major part of the conversation is to lighten up with Funny Talk.

Thus, in Part I of the specimen, Ga's discussion of the core topic, her obsessing about obsessing regarding Ed, is preceded by two funny episodes dealing with her looks, her vampire look and her sweet catholic girl look, and followed by a funny anecdote regarding her co-workers.

Funny Talk
gives you a comfortable expectation
in the way we banter back and forth
it's comfortable

Funny talk breaks up the tension
when we talk about something serious we need to break it up with something funny
—you can hear it in the tone of our voices--
to break up the tension
I know I feel insecure about being intense all the time

I think what I try to do is put in an entertainment value
when I talk about serious things with my friends
I, at least, try to make it funny
sweeten the deal

Ga constantly invites Ge to produce funny talk. Ga initiates it and Ge amplifies it:
I think I lead her into it
I stick it out and I don't know what she's going to do with it

Student Researcher: like an invitation?
Respondent: yes
Funny Talk uses 4 rhetorical devices and 1 semiotic tool.  
(1) **funny narratives:**  
Ga presents a series of funny narratives. An example is the anecdote involving her supervisor (69-76).

(2) **one-liners:**  
Ge seems to prefer one-liners, funny comments that sum up a situation. An example is her referring to Mike, a funny co-worker of Ga's as is it that Mike-guy? (55).

(3) **mimicking:**  
Both Ga and Ge like to mimic people's voices and speech pattern.  
An example by Ga imitating her co-workers, is "oh it's cool" (49);  
an example by Ge imitating the Latino woman, one of Ga's co-workers, is "hey! I gotta know your business" (61).

(4) **comic routines:**  
Ge likes to use comic routines drawn from stand-up comedy conventions. An example is her introducing inquiries about Ed's Polish background by using the standard story introduction: did you ever hear the story about ...? you-mean you never got the story about how the Haitian got to Poland? (161).

(5) **co-imaging:**  
As explained by the Student Researcher, "co-imaging is a visualization technique in which the partners conjure up a picture of a situation and draw on it to intensify the mood. One word can trigger an image and then the partners build from there". An example is sweet Catholic girl (line 10).

--The semiotic tool is joint laughter.  
The Student Researcher sees the relevance to this study of Jefferson's work on laughter in troubles-talk, as follows: 
'This case illustrates one of Jefferson's major findings (1984) that 'recurrently in troubles-talk the phenomenon of both parties laughing is associated with a distinctive feature of such talk; a time-out for plaisantries which we are calling a buffer topic.'  
She illustrates that speakers have various ways of inviting laughter (1979), such as the placement of a 'candidate laughable utterance' (83) and the options of acceptance and decline of invitation to laugh.  
Interestingly she alludes to what Ga calls 'co-imaging' by referring to the way that couples 'elaborate on the laughable item, using materials from their shared biography' (1984:354). In this case we have seen additional uses of shared biography to buffer troubles-talk. For example, stretching conversations around the core topic to achieve distance from the trouble (the respondent's imaginative notion of the 'conversation bubble'); creation of empathy (her notion of 'paralleling'), elliptical speech and references that foster bonding. Without the respondent's input, and without the contextualization which a long segment permits, it would be difficult if not
impossible to notice when shared history is utilized and how it functions in the conversation.

One of Jefferson's findings, based on her independent analysis of conversational interaction, is that buffer topics are 'recurrently initiated by the troubles-teller. That such talk is not introduced by a troubles-recipient appears to be one of the ways in which a co-participant specifically aligns him/herself as a troubles-recipient' (352). Jefferson goes on to elaborate on the role of the troubles-teller to 'project a serious or nonserious trajectory' (354) that can shift the mood or reinforce it.

The case of Ga and Ge largely supports the notion that the shift in mood and topic is a sensitive negotiation that takes verbal and nonverbal clues into account; that the receptivity of both the troubles-teller and troubles-recipient are taken into account (355); that the 'properly aligned' (346) troubles-recipient proceeds to be receptive to continuation of troubles-talk, even if the troubles-teller signals an occasion to laugh together; and that by and large, the troubles-teller sets the pace. The case of Ga and Ge illustrates how subtle invitations to laughter can be and that in such an intimate relationship, the troubles-recipient has prior 'permission' to take the initiative based on a deep understanding of the partner.

Jefferson also suggests that dyads and circumstances differ in their orientation to laughter and gloom (360). In the case under consideration here, both participants on this particular occasion seek resources for laughter more often than resources for more troubles-talk."

**The bonding Strategy:**

The comfort zone is due to the fact that we feel like the same person so we can talk about our insecurities together you wouldn't hurt yourself so we won't hurt each other

Bonding is used to signal that I'm ok, that my pain is ok to share, that I can keep talking. It is both asking for reassurance and giving reassurance.

The bonding strategy uses two rhetorical devices: (1) **paralleling** and (2) **elliptical speech**, and a series of semiotic tools, as follows:

(1) **paralleling**:

As explained by the Student Researcher, paralleling is a "technique for creating empathy by citing a common experience". The respondent sees paralleling as occurring either explicitly, as when Ge says I used to hate that too because I kinda have that same quality (lines 1-9) in which case the exchange of history is bonding or implicitly, as when Ge uses the expression sweet Catholic girl, implying but not stating that they are both perceived as such.

(2) **elliptical speech**:

Because of their closeness and shared history (shared biography, social life and culture) they function on the intuitive plane.

As stated by the Student Researcher, "there is no need to spell things out. Ga jumps to her serious obsessional talk without preliminaries (line 36), with Ge knowing that she has shifted the topic to Ed. Ge mentions Mike-guy (line 55) knowing/signaling she knows who Ga is thinking about among her co-workers. Ge mentions that Jack is a Capricorn (line 132) knowing Ga's bad history with Capricorn."
This situation is illustrated by their use of ya-know as an abbreviation, a sign that there is no need to expand (lines 23, 30, and 34).

There are 4 types of semiotic tools noted by the respondent in her commentaries: (1) nonverbal behavior, (2) phatic tokens, (3) affirmation/reassurance tokens and (4) expressions of togetherness.

(1) **nonverbal behavior**

The respondent describes the nonverbal behavior used by Ge to reassure her, as follows:

- She leans forward
- She has this way of nodding three times
- She'll pause and say something
- She holds her eyes half open and gives us this comfortable space

(2) **phatic tokens**

Phatic tokens are attention getters. Examples are:

- Ya-know meaning checking in, keeping connection
- I trail off here meaning: "we don't need to talk about this if you don't want to"

(3) **affirmation/reassurance tokens**

They convey the information that the listener is affirming the speaker. It means: go on, I'm listening.

As explained by the Student Researcher, "Ga interprets all of Ge's acknowledgements as showing great interest and complete understanding. This mutual show of interest helps regulate how long they spend on any topic, when the serious talk begins and for how long, and how long and when, Ga will hold the floor."

Examples are: uh-huh, yeah, shit!, wow!, oh really?!

(4) **Expressions of togetherness**

They convey the information that I don't have to explain because we're connected

Examples are: the discourse marker ya-know (floor holder); linguistic items such as: but, it, sometimes, shouldn't.

**STRATEGY FOR WATCHING OVER THE FRIENDSHIP:**

The one strategy for building/maintaining her relationship with Ge, is realized as attention centering on two areas: (1) sharing the spotlight and (2) avoiding breaking the spell, i.e., becoming apart by overdoing her anxiety.

(1) **sharing the spotlight**

Ga makes a concerted effort to share the spotlight with Ge.

At the beginning of Part II she gives Ge the floor with an invitation to talk about her relationship with Jack: (77) so I didn't know you had a new date with uh/

At the end of Part III she gets ready to do the same:

- I start editing myself
- I've taken so long
- Closure for me
- Spotlight for her

(2) **avoiding breaking the spell**

The fear of breaking the spell between herself and Ge because of her excessive tension, is constantly on her mind. About her obsessing, lines 36-47, she says:

- I was mad at myself once again
- I was afraid I would break the spell
Then, about her insecurity, line 54:

I was afraid I was breaking some invisible spell by speaking about it
I didn't want some mystic bubble to be broken

If it happens that they are apart, she makes sure that the connection is reestablished almost immediately. One instance occurs (161-165):

- we both have separate questions
- two issues
- we're both on a different wavelength for a second
- I meld the two questions (166)
- because it feels like we're together but apart
- I make a mutual territory of inquisitiveness

(2) PARTICIPANTS’ ALIGNMENTS

The participants orient to each other along a closeness: distance opposition.

Closeness:
The respondent sees herself and Ge as totally connected. They are one. Ge is an extension of herself:

- like we're one person
- we're in tune with each other
- she knows what I'm going to say
- I know she knows

They operate as a team:
conversations are something people create together
as soon as we set down our coffee cups, the dance begins, a familiar dance

Student Researcher: setting down the cups is like a trigger?
Respondent: yes

and again:
she gets back from me like Laurel and Hardy
I know my part, she knows hers

Distance:
There is only one moment of disconnectedness between them:
- we're on a different wavelength for a second (lines 161-165).

(3) INTERACTION TONE

There are two tones, serious/uncomfortable and light/comfortable.
when we talk about something serious we need to break it up with something funny to break up the tension

I know I feel insecure about being intense all the time
I think what I try to do is put in an entertainment value
when I talk about serious things with my friends I at least try to make it funny sweeten the deal
a major part of the conversation is to lighten up
II. REACTIVE MODE:

PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES
The respondent mentions her feelings or Ge's, only if connected with discomfort:
I am getting depressed and anxious
it was getting me nervous

I can hear in her voice she's still nervous about it
DATA FROM RESPONDENT'S ACCOUNT
PERTAINING TO INTERACTION CLIMATE

VF SECTION (1-35)

(1) STRATEGIES FOR ANXIETY REDUCTION:
   lightening up strategy through:
   - funny narrative
     a narrative story illustrating how I feel when I try to look alternative
     narrative story as an example
     sort of a mini-narrative
   - co-imaging:
     when Ge and I talk we use these images
     I had given her this image (me in this club with my vampire look)
     the key images are "black and 'blue'
     the key image is 'alternative'
     key image is 'mirror'
     key images are 'face', 'hair'
     key image is 'sweet Catholic girl'
     we are co-creating an image
     key images are 'Catholic school' and 'nuns'
   - one-liners (funnies)
     a 'funny'
     a 'one-liner'
     this is a quip
     one liner (a 'funny')
     diversion
   - mimicking
     mimicking the voice is funny

   bonding strategy through:
   - paralleling (the exchange of histories):
     the exchange of history in the beginning is bonding
     paralleling comes into here
     our shared history
     paralleling: I've had that image too
     so we have this thing in common
     she's been perceived in this way too
     so she could reassure me
     paralleling: she's telling me we share the same history

   - elliptical speech:
     we didn't have to spell it (the Vampire Look) out anymore

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS: total togetherness between Ga and Ge
   like we're one person
   we feel like the same person

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
   this section starts out light
VF SECTION (36-47)

I. INTERACTIVE MODE

(1) STRATEGIES
   Bonding Strategy through elliptical speech:
   because of our shared history and our comfort
   I don't need a seque here to talk about Ed
   ... Ge and I were in our intuitive plane
   ... there is no connection
   just jumped (to this topic)

   she simply acknowledged the shift in topic
   she knows where I'm coming from

(2) INTERACTION TONE
   uncomfortable;
   this is the most emotionally charged part of the conversation
   comfortable;
   the exchange of history (in the preceding sequences) opens up a comfort space
   now I feel comfortable to talk about Ed again

II. REACTIVE MODE
   PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES:
   so first I was frustrated because I couldn't say what I mean
   and now I'm judging myself for talking about it in the first place
   I was feeling insecure about myself
   I was picking on myself
   my ego was satiated
   ... I was mad at myself once again

   I was afraid I would break the spell
INTERACTIVE MODE
(1) STRATEGIES:
- **Lightening-up strategy** through:

**a funny**

I lighten up the conversation a bit (49)
when we talk about something serious we need to break it up with something funny to break up the tension (65)
I think what I try to do is put in an entertainment value, sweeten the deal (76)

**one-liners:**

I 'm leading her into a 'funny' (54)

it's the trajectory to the funny stuff that continues after this (55)

she achieves the lightening up by mentioning Mike and putting it that way: 'Mike-guy' (58)

her choice of words is a subtle 'funny'

it's funny because Mike is funny

'a funny' (60-61)

**funny narrative:**

personal narrative used to illustrate the point (72-76)

**mimicking:**

I mimic the voices of the people at work, that always makes us laugh (49)

I mimic her voice (72 & 75)

comic set-up:

this is a comic set-up (54)

**co-imaging:**

I... begin to build the image of my co-workers (51-52)

key word is 'them' (51)

'weird' is the key word (54)

key image is 'Mike-guy' (58)

here's that imagining thing going on (55)

she could picture Mike

she asks: "was it Mike?" to share the image -- to probe into the image and I had to share it

key images are 'Mike' and 'Angela' (56-59)

there's that imaging again: (65)

as soon as I mentioned something connected to work she's already imaging all the things I imagine

- **Bonding Strategy**

through **reassurance:**

she validates my feelings (48)

there was a protective quality about it (Ge's question)

through **elliptical speech:**

she already knew I was thinking about Mike because of our shared history (55)

that's our shared history operating here (63)

intuition and history come in here (65)
(2) INTERACTION TONE:

it begins to shift the mood (48)
her question snapped me out of my feelings (which were getting more serious and depressed and anxious)

this is semi-serious (51-52)
I'm ready for comic relief
this is serious (54)

II. REACTIVE MODE

PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES:
I feel edgy (54)
it was making me nervous (54)
I was so tense about it

it's like I'm afraid of over analyzing it … (54)
I was afraid I was breaking some invisible spell … (54)

I feel insecure about being tense all the time (76)

VF SECTION (77-105)

I. INTERACTIVE MODE
(1) STRATEGY FOR WATCHING OVER THE FRIENDSHIP:
sharing the spotlight

(2) INTERACTION TONE
this is the beginning of serious

II. REACTIVE MODE

PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES
Ge is a little shy too
VF SECTION (106-115)

I: INTERACTIVE MODE
INTERACTION TONE:
this is very serious(106)

II: REACTIVE MODE
PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES:
I can hear in her voice she's still worried about it (the date with Jack) even though we're laughing about it (106-115)

VF SECTION (116-155)

INTERACTIVE MODE
1) STRATEGIES FOR ANXIETY REDUCTION

-Lightening-up strategy through one-liners:
I'm even aware of her putting a 'funny' in to distract (116)

-Bonding strategy through elliptical speech:
we don't need to express it
no need to spell out the subtext (132)

Capricorn is an unspoken thing in our conversation
… she knows what I'm going to say (133-145)

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS:
connectedness between Ga and Ge:
I'm still connected with her emotionally (116)

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
we change the mood to lighten up
again we follow that with something lighter (145-155)
I think the segment is semi-serious… (116):
this segment is serious (133-145)
INTERACTIVE MODE

(1) STRATEGIES
   - STRATEGIES FOR ANXIETY REDUCTION:
     -lightening-up strategy through:
       stand-up comedian routine (161)
       one-liner (164-165)
     -bonding strategy through elliptical language:
       trailing off (181)

   - STRATEGY FOR WATCHING OVER FRIENDSHIP through
     sharing the spotlight (183):
     I start editing myself
     I’ve taken so long
     closure for me spotlight for her

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS:
   temporary disconnectedness between Ga and Ge
   we're on a different wavelength for a second (164-165)

(3) INTERACTION TONE:
   light (it could have been a core if they had talked about doing the charts but Ge
drew
   my attention to something else =Ed’s strange ethnicity, 161)
3B: GEORGINA'S ACCOUNT
II. VERBAL FLOW STRUCTURE

A: SEGMENTATION OF TALK IN SPECIMEN

1) RESPONDENT'S SEGMENTATION:

In her Blow-by-Blow, Ge gives a discursive commentary about what was taking place. Then, in the Follow-up Interviewing, she segments the specimen on the basis of two orders of criteria, objective and subjective.

(1) The objective criteria are the topics and subtopics being talked about.
(2) The subjective criteria are the differences in the level of tension underlying the talk.

This yields 5 main topics, and 3 main parts displaying a **downward progression** of tension, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I: High Tension Topics (1-115)</th>
<th>Part II: Ga and I move to a more light-hearted theme (116-155)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 1:</strong> Ga's insecurity about her appearance (1-35)</td>
<td><strong>Topic 4:</strong> Astrology (116-155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:</strong> Ga's image of herself (1-17)</td>
<td>then I also start talking about how I cast his natal chart and compared it to mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga is talking about how she would like to be more alternative and less traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's highlighted and spirited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2:</strong> consolation (18-35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess I'm just agreeing with her and kinda empathizing with her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 2:</strong> Ga questions the wisdom of her discussing Ed at work and I send her off on a different topic (36-76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:</strong> talking about Ed (36-47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what Ga is talking about is how she met him and how they are going out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2:</strong> co-workers (48-59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her coworkers’ reaction to her story about this guy she met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3:</strong> Angela (60-76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga is just describing her superior at work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 3:</strong> my plans for my date (77-115)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:</strong> the date arrangement (77-105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay we’re talking about my date, my planned date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2:</strong> how I feel about Jack (106-115)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m just telling Ga that things are going pretty well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so I'm trying to explain to Ga that we decided that we were going to meet for a drink but we haven’t picked the place yet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga didn’t understand me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part III:</strong> Both Ga and I are more confident. Resolution is achieved (156-187)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic 5:</strong> Ed’s heritage (156-187)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me and Ga are trying to figure out, since Ed is half Polish and half Haitian, how a Polack and Haitian got together ya-know how they met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript of Talk segmented and characterized as per respondent:

1: Gail's insecurity about her appearance

1.1: Gail's image of herself
Ga (1): It's funny sometimes I dress up in like blue and black
   (2): like ya-know the alternative crowd
   (3): I look in the mirror
   (4): I don't look alternative at all (laughter)
   (5): like I just can't/
   (6): just doesn't happen
   (7): with my face or my hair
Ge (8): yeah
Ga (9): ya-know
Ge (10): you've got that sweet Catholic look there (laughter)
Ga (11): no matter where I go
Ge (12): uh-huh
   (13): but that's just cool
   (14): sweet Catholic girl alternative (laughter)
   (15): rockin' Catholic girl (laughter)
Ga (16): it's totally messed up ya-know
Ge (17): shit!

1.2: Consolation
Ga (18): that's funny I guess
   (19): ya-know
   (20): I didn't even go to Catholic school
   (21): when I say that people go "really!?" (laughter)
   (22): they expect I was raised by nuns or-something
   (23): like I'm really not like ya-know/
Ge (24): I used to hate that too
   (25): because I kind-a have that same quality
Ga (26): uh-huh
Ge (27): but as I got older
   (28): it's better
   (29): I'd rather look like that than a rat
   (30): ya-know
Ga (31): uh-huh
   (32): it's true
Ge (33): not that
   (34): ya-know
   (35): the only alternative to Catholic is a rat (laughter)

[pause]
2: Gail questions the wisdom of discussing Ed at work and I send her off on a different topic

2.1: Talking about Ed at work

Ga (36): but I was talking about it last night to like two people at work
(37): and I'm like /
(38): --oh
(39): I'm really cursing it now--
(40): I'm like/
Ge (41): uh-huh
Ga (42): it's just I kept it/
(43): kept it coming out
(44): I'm just like
(45): "shouldn't talk about it so much"
(46): but
(47): anyway

2.2: Co-Workers

Ge (48): what were they saying about it?
Ga (49): they're like "oh it's so cool"
(50): they're like/
(51): and half of them are going to be at the Topic after work
(52): afterwards
Ge (53): oh really?!
Ga (54): it's going to be really weird
Ge (55): is it that Mike-guy?
Ga (56): yeah
(57): Mike and Angela
(58): I didn't see Mike but Mike'll probably be in to-morrow
(59): but Angela will be there

2.3: Angela

Ge (60): she's not the one
(61): "hey! I gotta know your business"
Ga (62): (laughter) no
(63): she's not the Latino woman
(64): no
(65): she's the supervisor there but she's just like two years older than me
Ge (66): uh-huh
(67): has she got te attitude or not?
Ga (68): no
(69): she's like totally rebel supervisor
(70): she doesn't really
(71): tell us what to do
(72): one time she's like "come on guys, quiet down!"
(73): we all started laughing
(74): she's behind a little cubicle
(75): she's like: "they're laughing at me" (laughter)
(76): it was funny
3: My Plans for my Date:

3.1: The Date Arrangement
Ga (77): so I didn't know you had a new date with uh
Ge (78): Jeff
Ga (79): where you gonna go?
Ge (80): uh
   (81): we just left it at
   (82): well we decided the general place we're gonna go
   (83): we're gonna go meet for a drink
   (84): but then we said/
   (85): we said we'll do an idea generation
   (86): ya-know think about which place
Ga (87): ok
Ge (88): we're just like going to meet minds again on Wednesday
Ga (89): that's great!
   (90): where you gonna meet
   (91): do you know?
   (92): Joe's
Ge (93): no
   (94): we just have to meet
   (95): that's what we're thinking about
Ga (96): ok
Ge (97): that's where we're gonna meet
Ga (98): I thought you were going to meet somewhere and then figure out
   (99): where you're gonna go
Ge (100): uh-huh
   (101): that's the idea
Ga (102): for dinner
   (103): ya-know?
Ge (104): yeah
Ga (105): and for a little drink and then ...

3.2: How I feel about Jack
Ge (106): I don't know Gabrielle
   (107): it's going ok
   (108): he's really easy to talk to
   (109): which is rare
Ga (110): that's cool
Ge (111): for me
   (112): the most/
   (113): I guess
Ga (114): and I guess
   (115): don't analyze it ya-know

4: Astrology
Ge (116): I did the charts
Ga (117): you did!?
Ge (118): kind-of embarrassed to admit it
Ga (119): that's cool (laughter)
Ge (120): but I did the charts
Ga (121): that's cool
Ge (122): they came out really good
   (123): they did
   (124): I'm surprised
Ga (125): wow!
Ge (126): because well
   (127): you know a little bit about astrology
   (128): right?
Ga (129): yeah
   (130): a teeny bit
(131): yeah
Ge (132): he's a Capricorn
Ga (133): oh no
(134): a Capricorn
Ge (135): Capricorn and Sagittarius
(136): that's always bad
Ga (137): yeah
(138): but my sister is Capricorn and we get along splendidly
Ga (139): uh-huh
Ge (140): but all the other signs
(141): like the moon sign, the ascendant and all that, came out good
Ga (142): that's cool
Ge (143): I-mean it matched up perfectly
Ga (144): that's great
Ge (145): we fell into the best category
Ga (146): so how did you get out of him the date and time oh his birth
(147): without/
Ge (148): I told him
(149): "hey I could do your chart" (laughter)
(150): well ya-know he's into that 'I Ching' stuff
(151): and I said: "I never really explored 'I Ching' but
(152): I can do astrology a little bit
(153): very basic astrology
(154): I-mean if you want real astrology
(155): you're going to have to pay somebody"

5: Ed's Heritage

Ga (156): well
(157): I know where Ed was born
(158): he was born in Poland
Ge (159): wow!
Ga (160): yeah
Ge (161): you-mean you never got the story about how the Haitian got to Poland?
Ga (162): no
(163): that's what I'm trying to figure out how/
Ge (164): Poland
(165): isn't that one of the iron blocks?
Ga (166): I-mean there were Communists then!
Ge (167): yeah
Ga (168): how could they have met?
Ge (169): wow!
Ga (170): that's what I don't understand
(171): unless
(172): I-mean ya-know if/
(173): if he had a relative in the army but
(174): how could they be in Poland when it was still Communist?
(175): I just don't understand how a Haitian and Polish person could have met
Ge (176): maybe it was really something
(177): really neat like they were diplomats or-something
Ga (178): yeah
(179): something really funky like that
Ge (180): yeah
Ga (181): I know his dad...
(182): his parents are really well educated
(183): something like one has a PhD or-something-like-that
Ge (184): uh-huh
Ga (185): maybe it was something like that
(186): but definitely something really funky
Ge (187): yeah
(2) ANALYST'S SEGMENTATION: VERBAL FLOW SECTIONS

The systematization of the respondent's segmentation yields candidate basic units, the Verbal Flow Sections. They are obtained as follows:

DEFINING CRITERIA FOR VERBAL FLOW:

**Type of Talk:** SHOOTING THE BREEZE  
**Modality of Talk:** displaced  
**Focality:** focal

SEGMENTATION CRITERIA FOR VF SECTIONS:

Topics:
1: Ga's insecurity about her appearance (1-35)  
   1.1: Ga's image of herself (1-17)  
   1.2: consolation (18-35)  
2: Ga questions the wisdom of discussing Ed at work and I send her off on a different topic (36-76)  
   2.1: talking about Ed at work (36-47)  
   2.2: co-workers (48-59)  
   2.3: Angela (60-76)  
3: My plans for my date  
   3.1: the date arrangement (77-105)  
   3.2: how I feel about Jack (106-115)  
4: Astrology (116-155)  
5: Ed's Heritage (156-187)
(3) COMPARISON between A'S and R'S SEGMENTATION

The analyst's and respondent's segmentation of talk in the specimen are identical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYST’S and RESPONDENT’S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Ga’s insecurity about her appearance (1-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Ga’s image of herself (1-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Consolation (18-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Ga questions the wisdom of….. (36-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1: talking about Ed at work (36-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2: Co-workers (48-59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3: Angela (60-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: My plans for my date (77-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1: date arrangement (77-105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2: how I feel about Jack (106-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Astrology (116-155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Ed’s heritage (156-187)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B: BASIC UNITS: INTERNAL STRUCTURE
and
PARTIAL RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION of
TALK IN CORES

Each VF Section is now examined in turn in order to ascertain how many basic units it contains. Then, the internal structure of each basic unit, and the partial rhetorical organization of Talk in their respective cores, are described in some detail.
VF SECTION (1-17)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Talk: SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality of Talk: displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focality: focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (1-17):

- **topic:** Ga's insecurity about her appearance
- **subtopic:** Ga's image of herself

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (1): It's funny sometimes I dress up in like blue and black
(2): like ya-know the alternative crowd
(3): I look in the mirror
(4): I don't look alternative at all (*laughter*)
(5): like I just can't/
(6): just doesn't happen
(7): with my face or my hair
Ge (8): yeah
Ga (9): ya-know
Ge (10): you've got that sweet Catholic look there (*laughter*)
Ga (11): no matter where I go
Ge (12): uh-huh
(13): but that's just cool
(14): sweet Catholic girl alternative (*laughter*)
(15): rockin' Catholic girl (*laughter*)
Ga (16): it's totally messed up ya-know
Ge (17): shit!

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (1-17). It is a RITUAL BANTER, specified by the semantic schema: Ga and Ge talk about Ga's appearance.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF RITUAL BANTER (1-17)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF RITUAL BANTER:
The RITUAL BANTER has a nucleus and 2 satellites. The nucleus has an entry and a core. The entry is a univox by Ga. The core is multilogic, a duo initiated by Ga and followed up by Ge, with one round. The second member of the duo has an extension, a co-construction dyad initiated by Ga. The first satellite is a back channel dyad initiated by Ga. The second satellite is a univocal remark by Ga. It has a satellite, a back channel dyad initiated by Ga, the on-going speaker.

**NUCLEUS + extension**

**ENTRY:** Ga (1): it's funny

D1: Ga
(1-7)

**CORE**

D2: Ge
(10)

**CO-CONSTRUCTION (dyad)**

Ga (11)
Ge (12)

(13-15)

**SATELLITES**

**Back Channel (dyad)**
Ga (9): ya-know¹
Ge (8): yeah²

**REMARK**
Ga (16)

**B.Ch (dyad)**
Ga (16): ya-know³
Ge (17): shit⁴

Respondent's account:

- fn1
  agreement
  bid to have Ge reiterate what she is saying
  implicit question: do you follow what I am saying?
- fn2, 3 and 4
  agreement
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

D1: Ga expressing her insecurity (in format of narrative)

(1): sometimes I dress up in like blue and black
(2): like ya-know the alternative crowd
(3): I look in the mirror
(4): I don't look alternative  +laughter

REPAIRABLE
(5): [1 just can't]

(6): just does'nt happen
(7): with my face and hair

D2: Ge reassuring Ga by lightening up

•1: initial formulation:
(10): you've got that sweet Catholic look there 3  +laughter

CO-CONSTRUCTION
filling in by Ga:
(11): no matter where I go
agreement by Ge:
(12): uh-huh

(13): but that's just cool

•2: first reformulation:
(14): sweet Catholic girl alternative  +laughter

•3: second reformulation:
(15): rockin' Catholic girl  +laughter

REMARK
agreement by Ga
(16): it's totally messed up
Respondent's account:

-fn1
Ga describing herself: Ga is talking about how she would like to be more alternative and less traditional indirectly asking Ge about alternativeness
I guess I'm just agreeing with her
describing herself
light hearted, spirited way
empathy
Ga's insecurity really sticks out here: it's explicit in content
Ga is self-deprecating
on some level it concerns her (1-17)

-fn2
bonding is shown by Ge making light of what Ga is saying
Ge feels compelled to lighten up
shows that it's ok to feel that way
Ge uses this technique (lightening up) in most of the conversation (10-15)

-fn2'
making light of what Ga is saying to show that it's ok to feel that way (giving reassurance)
Ge uses this technique in most of the conversation
I'm agreeing with her (that she looks traditional when she would like to look alternative

-fn3
explanation of Ga's first statement/rehashing of previous statement lines 6 and 7

-fn4
agreement with Ge

-fn5
elaboration/reassurance (14-15)

-fn6
agreement
VF SECTION (18-35)

(1) RECAPITULATION

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:
Type of Talk: SHOOTING THE BREEZE
Modality of Talk: displaced
Focality: focal

Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (18-35):

- **topic**: Ga's insecurity about her appearance
- **subtopic**: Consolation

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (18): that's funny I guess
   (19): ya-know
   (20): I didn't even go to Catholic school
   (21): when I say that people go "really!?" (*laughter*)
   (22): they expect I was raised by nuns or-something
   (23): like I'm really not like ya-know/
Ge (24): I used to hate that too
   (25): because I kind-a have that same quality
Ga (26): uh-huh
Ge (27): but as I got older
   (28): it's better
   (29): I'd rather look like that than a rat
   (30): ya-know
Ga (31): uh-huh
   (32): it's true
Ge (33): not that
   (34): ya-know
   (35): the only alternative to Catholic is a rat (*laughter*)

[pause]

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (18-35). It is a REASSURANCE RITUAL, specified by the semantic schema: Ge reassures Ga.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF REASSURANCE RITUAL (18-35)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF REASSURANCE RITUAL:

The REASSURANCE RITUAL has a nucleus and 2 satellites.
The nucleus has an entry and a core.
The entry is a univox by Ga.
The core is multilogic, a duo initiated by Ga and followed up by Ge, with one round.

The first satellite is a univocal back channel by Ga.
The second satellite is a back channel dyad initiated by Ge, the on-going speaker.
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

D1: Ga expressing her experience of how she is perceived (in format of narrative)\(^1\)

(20): I didn't even go to Catholic school
(21): when I say that people go: “really!??” +laughter
(22): they expect I was raised by nuns or- something
(23): like I'm really not like ya-know... (implied: an alternative person)

D2: Ge reassuring Ga

empathizing (in format of narrative)\(^2\)

(24): I used to hate that too
(25): because I kind-a have the same quality
(27): but as I got older
(28): it's better

joke

1: joke proper.\(^3\)
(29): I'd rather look like that than a rat

2: elaboration.\(^4\)
(33): not that
(34): ya-know
(35): the only alternative to Catholic is a rat +laughter

Respondent's account:

-fn1
Ga: statement describing image she has (20-23)

-fn2
I guess I'm just agreeing with her and kind-a empathizing with her empathizing/agreement (24-27)
empathy was main theme (24-35)

-fn3
making a joke (29)

-fn4
correcting herself on previous statement (33)+(35)
VF SECTION (36-47)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:
Type of Talk: SHOOTING THE BREEZE
Modality of Talk: displaced
Focality: focal
Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (36-47):
topic: Ga questions the wisdom of discussing Ed at work

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (36): but I was talking about it last night to like two people at work
(37): [and I'm like]
(38): --oh
(39): I'm really cursing it now--
(40): [I'm like]
Ge (41): uh-huh
Ga (42): it's just I [kept it]
(43): kept it coming out
(44): I'm just like:
(45): "shouldn't talk about it so much"
(46): but
(47): anyway...

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (36-47). It is an INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ga tells Ge that she talked about Ed at work.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (36-47)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:

The INFORMING has a nucleus and one satellite. The nucleus has an entry and a core, both univoxes by Ga addressed to Ge.

The satellite is a univocal back channel by Ge.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
\text{NUCLEUS} & \text{SATELLITE} \\
\hline
\text{ENTRY: Ga (36): but} & \\
\text{CORE: Ga (36-40)} & \text{BACK CHANNEL} \\
& \text{Ge (41): uh-huh} \\
& \text{(42-47)} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Respondent's account:
- fn1
  agreement with Ga
  indicates that Ge is listening but does not want to talk further about the topic
  Ga does not pick up on it
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

Ga's informing (in format of narrative)\(^1\)

(36): I was talking about it\(^2\) last night to like two people at work

REPAIRABLE

(37): [and I'm like]

PARENTHESES

(38): oh\(^4\)

(39): I'm cursing it now!

REPAIRABLE

(40): [I'm like]

(42): it's just I [kept it]

(43): kept it coming out\(^5\)

(44): I'm just like:

(45): "shouldn't talk about it so much"\(^6\)

REPAIRABLE

(46): but

(47): anyway…

Respondent's account:

-fn1
what Ga is talking about is how she met him (Ed) and how they are going out
when asked why Ge did not comment on lines 36-47 (Ga’s co-workers), she said that she did not feel that she had a part in it
Ga was talking about something Ge knew nothing about
she was not asking Ge for reassurance so Ge's role was put on hold.
she (Ge) was not interested in the conversation and in fact states that she is not supportive at all and is even bitchy which she felt bad about.(36-47)

Ga talks indirectly about Ed
describing how she's talking, her behavior
Ga also feels insecure
-fn2
it was clearly understood by both parties what "it" referred to (=meeting Ed)
focusing on previous conversation (36)

-fn3
Ga's insecurity is revealed by her fumbling for words (37)+(40)

-fn4
'oh' marks speaker involvement

-fn5
reiterating what she said initially (42-47)

-fn6
Ga: wondering if she should be talking about relationship so soon: implied question
Ge doesn't explicitly answer it (45)
VF SECTION (48-59)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Talk:</strong> SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (48-59):**
- **topic:** I send her off on a different topic
- **subtopic:** co-workers

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ge (48): what were they saying about it?
Ga (49): they're like "oh it's so cool"
(50): [they're like]
(51): and half of them are going to be at the Tropic after work
(52): afterwards
Ge (53): oh really?!
Ga (54): it's going to be really weird
Ge (55): is it that Mike-guy?
Ga (56): yeah
(57): Mike and Angela
(58): I didn't see Mike but Mike 'll probably be in to-morrow
(59): but Angela will be there

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (48-54). It is a QUERY, specified by the semantic schema: Ge asks Ga how her co-workers responded to her talking about Ed.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (48-59)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has a nucleus and 1 satellite.
The nucleus has has only a core, a dialogue initiated by Ge and addressed to Ga, with two exchanges.

The satellite is a univocal back channel by Ge.

Respondent's account:
- fn1
'oh' marks speaker involvement
Ge is disinterested
does not ask Ga to explain further
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

Ex1: Ge's first question:
M1: Ge's Request for information
   (48): what were they saying about it?
M2: Ga's Response
   response proper:
   (49): they're like: "oh it's cool"
   REPAIRABLE
   (50): [they're like]
   elaboration (changing topic):²
   (51): half of them are going to be at the Tropic after work
   (52): afterwards
   (54): it's going to be really weird

Ex: Ge's second question:
M1: Ge's Request for information
   (55): is it that Mike-guy?
M2: Ga's Response
   •1: response proper
   ••1: affirmation:
   (56): yeah
   ••2: echoing with correction:
   (57): Mike and Angela
   •2: elaboration (explaining correction):
   (58): I didn't see Mike [but]
   PARENTHESIS
   (58): Mike'll probably be in to-morrow
   (59): but Angela will be there

Respondent's account:
-fn1
Ga is talking about her co-workers' reaction to her story about this guy she met
Ge getting a feel for how people are reacting to what Ga is saying (48-50)

Ge on the one hand is tired of the topic
but on the other hand Ga is her friend and she does not want to appear rude
instead she hopes through her cueing that Ga will realize this on her own and change the topic (48)

Ge tries to let Ga know (that she wants to change the topic) by asking technical questions and responding with short answers, just enough to answer Ga
Ga answers elaborately
Ga answers the question and describes co-workers’ reaction
Ga elaborates and topic is changed (49-54)

Ge asks another question, trying to figure out who is who
being an analyst

Ga’s yes/no answer (56-59)
VF SECTION (60-76)

(1) RECAPITULATION

a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Talk:</strong> SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (60-76):**

- **topic:** I send her off on a different topic
- **subtopic:** Angela

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ge (60): she's not the one
   (61): "hey! I gotta know your business"
Ga (62): *(laughter)* no
   (63): she's not the Latino woman
   (64): no
   (65): she's the supervisor there but she's just like two years older than me
Ge (66): uh-huh
Ge (67): has she got the attitude or not?
Ga (68): no
   (69): she's like totally rebel supervisor
   (70): she doesn't really
   (71): tell us what to do
   (72): one time she's like "come on guys, quiet down!"
   (73): we all started laughing
   (74): she's behind a little cubicle
   (75): she's like: "they're laughing at me" *(laughter)*
   (76): it was funny

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (60-76). It is a QUERY, specified by the semantic schema: Ge asks Ga about Angela.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (60-76)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The query has a nucleus and one satellite. The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by Ge and addressed to Ga with two exchanges.

The satellite is a back channel univox by Ge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (60-61)</td>
<td>M2: Ga (62-65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex2</td>
<td>Back Channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga (66): uh-huh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>M1: Ge (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex3</td>
<td>M2: Ga (68-76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

Ex 1: initial use of schema¹

M1: Ge's Request for information (who is Angela?)¹
(60): she's not the one:
(61): “hey! I gotta know your business!”

M2: Ga's Response²

• 1: first formulation
  • 1: negation:
   (62): no + laughter
  • 2: echoing of M1:
   (63): she's not the Latino woman
• 2: reformulation
  • 1: negation:
   (64): no
  • 2: elaboration (description of Angela)³
   (65): she's the supervisor there but she's just like two years older than me

Ex 2: additional use of schema

M1: Ge's request for information:⁴
(67): has she got the attitude or not?

M2: Ga's Response

• 1: answer proper:⁵
(68): no
• 2: elaboration of answer (description of Angela)⁶
(69): she's like totally rebel superior
(70): she doesn't really
(71): tell us what to do
• 3: further elaboration (in the format of an anecdote):⁷
(72): one time she like: "come on guys, quiet down!"
(73): we all started laughing
(74): she's behind a little cubicle
(75): she's like: "they're laughing at me!" + laughter
(76): it was funny

Respondent's account:
-fn1
Ge becomes less interested in the topic because Ga isn't playing the role of seeking reassurance (62-76)
-fn1'
Ge asks another question (60)
-fn2
Ga answers question (62-64)
-fn3
describes the person she was originally talking about (65)
-fn4
Ge asks another question (67)

-fn5
Ga's answer (68)

-fn6
goes on to further describe superior (69-71)

-fn7
tells anecdote (72-76)
VF SECTION (77-105)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Talk: SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality of Talk: displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focality: focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (77-105):

- **topic**: My plans for my date
- **subtopic**: The date arrangement

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (77): so I didn't know you had a new date with uh
Ge (78): Jack
Ga (79): where you gonna go?
Ge (80): [uh]
  (81): [we just left it at]
  (82): well we decided the general place we're gonna go
  (83): we're gonna go meet for a drink
  (84): but then [we said]
  (85): we said we'll do an idea generation
  (86): ya-know think about which place
Ga (87): ok
Ge (88): we're just like going to meet minds again on Wednesday
Ga (89): that's great!
Ga (90): where you gonna meet
  (91): do you know?
  (92): Joe's?
Ge (93): no
  (94): we just have to meet
  (95): that's what we're thinking about
Ga (96): oh ok
Ge (97): that's where we're gonna meet
Ga (98): I thought you were going to meet somewhere and then figure out
  (99): where you're gonna go
Ge (100): uh-huh
  (101): that's the idea
Ga (102): for dinner?
  (103): ya-know?
Ge (104): yeah
Ga (105): and for a little drink and then ...
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There are two basic units, as follows:
(1)VF SubStretch(77-89) is a QUERY, specified by the semantic schema: Ga asks Ge where she is going with her date.
(2)VF SubStretch (90-105) is also a QUERY, specified by the semantic schema: Ga asks Ge again where she is going with her date.
(3.1) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (77-89)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:

The QUERY has only a nucleus.
The latter has an entry, a core an exit attempt and an exit.
The entry, exit attempt and exit are univoxes by Ga.
The core is a dialogue initiated by Ga and addressed to Ge, with one exchange.
The first member of the exchange has an extension, a univocal co-construction by Ge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS + extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ga (77): so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ga (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT ATTEMPT: Ga(87): ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT: Ga (89): that's great!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

M1: Ga's request for information

1: preparation:
   (77): I didn't know you had a new date with [uh] 1'

   CO-CONSTRUCTION  
   Ge (78): Jack

•2: Ga's request proper:
   (79): where you gonna go?

M2: Ge's response

  REPAIRABLE
  (80): [uh]
  (81): [we just left it at]

initiation:
   (82): well

devvelopment:
   (82): we decided the general place we're gonna go
   (83): we're gonna go meet for a drink
   (84): then [we said]
   (85): we said we'll do an idea generation
   (86): ya-know think about which place (to go next)
   (88): we're just like going to meet minds again on Wednesday

Respondent's account:

- fn1
ok we're talking about my date, my planned date, so that I'm trying to explain to Ga that we decided that we would meet and then figure out from there
I'm trying to explain to Ga that we decided that we were going to meet for a drink but we haven't picked the place yet (where to go next)
Ga didn't understand me (77-88)

Ge tries to have Ga clearly understand exactly what is going on with her date however Ge's voice becomes much softer and is choppy and hard to follow (77-105)

Ge showing feeling of awkwardness and ambivalence
Ge felt awkward because of talking about the situation with Jack
uncertain about the relationship
this led to misunderstanding
Ge was being careful of what she was saying, choppy and hard to understand
Ge torn because did and didn't want to talk about it

**Student Researcher: How does Ga respond to this?**
Ga is reassured but keeps plugging away anyway

**Student Researcher: were you uncomfortable by this?**
yes, because made more aware of how I felt

Ge's tone of voice became softer
she doesn't want 'to be heard'

by-product of how I feel
this is because the subject becomes more difficult to talk about
while Ge is happy to change the topic it is not in the direction she had hoped
at this point there is both ambiguity and confusion on Ge's part
Ge is torn between wanting and not wanting to discuss Jack
Ge felt awkward discussing Jack because she first wanted to think about it and then discuss it (77-105)

in the first section my respondent said she did not intend to show her true feelings (80-88)

-fn1'
indirect question: Ga inquires about Jack (do you have a date with Jack?) (77)

-fn2
Ge answers question (78)

-fn3
Ga asks question (79)

-fn4
Ge tries to answer question
expressing hesitation almost subconsciously (not intending to) (80-81)
(3.2) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUERY (90-105)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF QUERY:
The QUERY has a nucleus and 2 satellites. 
The nucleus has only a core, a dialogue initiated by Ga and addressed to Ge, with 2 exchanges. 
The first satellite is a univocal back channel by Ga. 
The second satellite is a back channel dyad initiated by Ga, the ongoing speaker.

** Respondent's account:**
- fn1
  'oh' marks speaker involvement
- fn2
  Ge answers 'yeah' showing she is still part of the conversation but doesn't want to talk further
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

Ex1: initial use of schema:
M1: Ga's request for information
  •1: request proper
    (90): where you gonna meet
    (91): do you know?
  •2: request proper (rephrasing):
    (92): Joe's?
M2: Ge's response
  •1: response proper (negation)
    (93): no
  •2: elaboration:
    (94): we just have to meet
    (95): that's what we're thinking about
    (97): that's where we're going to meet

Ex2: follow-up use of schema
M1: Ga persisting with request:
    (98): I thought you were going to meet somewhere and then figure out
    (99): where you're gonna go

M2: Ge's response:
    (100): uhhuh
    (101): that's the idea

    (102): for dinner
    (105): and for a little drink and then...

Respondent's account:
- fn1
  Ga asking same question in different manner (90-92)
- fn2
  trying to explain to Ga again (93-95)
- fn3
  Ge overanalyzing it (97)
(it seems that it should be 'that’s why we’re going to meet', not 'that's where we're going to meet')
-fn4
Ga doesn't understand
Ga tries to figure out what Ge and her date have planned
Ga tries to tell Ge what she thinks she (Ge) meant (98-99)

-fn5
Ge answers question with 'uh-huh' confirming but not elaborating (100-101)
Ge tries to change the topic through giving short, confirming answers which try to indicate a wish to switch topic but is unsuccessful until around line 116
Ge confirming but not elaborating

-fn6
Ga still plugging away (102)+(105)
VF SECTION (106-115)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Talk:</strong> SHOOTING THE BREEZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modality of Talk:</strong> displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focality:</strong> focal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (106-115):**
- **topic:** My plans for my date
- **subtopic:** How I feel about Jack (106-115)

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ge (106): I don't know Gabrielle
(107): it's going ok
(108): he's really easy to talk to
(109): which is rare
Ga (110): that's cool
Ge (111): for me
(112): the most
(113): I guess/
Ga (114): and I guess
(115): don't analyze it, ya-know

(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (106-115). It is an INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ge tells Ga how she feels about Jack.
(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (106-113)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:
The INFORMING has a nucleus and 2 satellites.
The nucleus has an entry and a core.
The entry is a univox by Ge.
The core is a univox by Ge addressed to Ga.

The first satellite is a univocal back channel by Ga.
The second satellite is a univocal remark by Ga.

Respondent's account:
-fn1
her hesitation is more explicit by her expressing her doubt directly
something she hadn't done before
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

Ge's disclosure of her feelings:¹
disclosure proper:
   (107) it's going ok
elaboration (description)
   (108): he's really easy to talk to
   (109): which is rare
   (111): for me

REPAIRABLE:²
(112): [the most]
(113): [I-guess]

REMARK
advice by Ga:³
(115): don't analyze it ya-know

Respondent's account:
-fn1
Ge feels compelled to explain to Ga how things are going
Ge believes that Ga, even though she does not ask directly, wants to know

Ge feels compelled to finally discuss her feelings for Jack
Ge feeling compelled to give a 'taste' of how things are going to Ga
how I feel about Jack
just kind-a telling Ga that things are going well so far (107-113)

her response seems to indicate an implied question on the part of Ga
her hesitation is more explicit by her expressing her doubt directly something she had not done before
in both cases her voice remains quite soft
this is because she does not 'want to be heard'
"this is a product of how I feel", she says
this demonstrates a psychological state
this is shown in only one other section
this is a topic that hits 'close to home' and is the most personal
as the topic continues the subject becomes more and more difficult to discuss
Ge does not like talking about things of this nature
she is an introvert who keeps her feelings to herself most of the time
by expressing how she feels she is letting Ga further into her being and thus becomes vulnerable
there is a sense of urgency to steer the topic as quickly as possible (106-113)

this is indicated by my respondent by her comment 'treading on ice'
to Ge, Ga while being supportive, isn't picking up on her 'cues' and that really frustrates Ge although in the second section on Jack Ge is the one who initiates the talk with Ga responding without asking questions (106-113)

-fn2 intentionally expressing hesitation (112-113)

-fn3 Ga supporting Ge Ga proceeds to give advice which leaves Ge flustered because it was not asked for again this hints at Ge's psychological state (114-115)
VF SECTION (116-155)
(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

**Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:**
Type of Talk: SHOOTING THE BREEZE
Modality of Talk: displaced
Focality: focal

**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (116-155):**
topic: Astrology

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ge (116): I did the charts
Ga (117): you did!?  
Ge (118): kind-of embarrassed to admit it
Ga (119): that's cool (*laughter*)
Ge (120): but I did the charts
Ga (121): that's cool
Ge (122): they came out really good
   (123): they did
   (124): I'm surprised
Ga (125): wow!
Ge (126): because well
   (127): you know a little bit about astrology
   (128): right?
Ga (129): yeah
   (130): a teeny bit
   (131): yeah
Ge (132): he's a Capricorn
Ga (133): oh no
   (134): a Capricorn
Ge (135): Capricorn and Sagittarius
   (136): that's always bad
Ga (137): yeah
   (138): but my sister is Capricorn and we get along splendidly
Ga (139): uh-huh
Ge (140): but all the other signs
   (141): like the moon sign, the ascendant and all that, came out good
Ga (142): that's cool
Ge (143): I-mean it matched up perfectly
Ga (144): that's great
Ge (145): we fell into the best category
Ga (146): so how did you get out of him the date and time oh his birth
   (147): without/
Ge (148): I told him
   (149): "hey I could do your chart" (*laughter*)
   (150): well ya-know he's into that 'I Ching' stuff
   (151): and I said: 'I never really explored 'I ching' but
   (152): I can do astrology a little bit
   (153): very basic astrology
   (154): I-mean if you want real astrology
   (155): you're going to have to pay somebody"
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There is only one basic unit, VF Stretch (116-155). It is an INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ge tells Ga that she did Jack’s astrological chart.

(3) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (116-155)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:

The INFORMING has a nucleus and 11 satellites. The nucleus has only a core, a univox by Ge addressed to Ga.

The satellites include 9 univocal back channels by Ga and 2 Incidental Queries. The first incidental query has an entry and a core. The entry is a univox. The core is a dialogue initiated by Ge, the ongoing speaker, and addressed to Ga, with one exchange. The second incidental query has an entry and a core. The entry is a univox by Ga. The core is a dialogue initiated by Ga and addressed to Ge, with one exchange.
**Respondent's account:**
- fn1
  exclamation of surprise (117)
- fn2
  Ga asking/checking/following what Ge is saying (125)
- fn3
  'oh' marks speaker involvement
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

Ge’s informing
•1: preparation:\(^1\)
  (116): I did the charts
  (118): kind-a embarrassed to admit it\(^2\)
  (120): but I did the charts
•2: informing proper:\(^3\)
  (122): they came out really good
  (123): they did
•3: elaboration
  •1: one bad sign
    preparation:
    (124): I’m surprised
    (126): because

INCIDENTAL QUERY

M1: Ge’s request for confirmation:\(^4\)
  (127): you know a little bit about astrology
  (128): right?
M2: Ga’s confirmation
  •1: affirmation:
    (129): yeah
  •2: echoing:\(^5\)
    (130): a teeny bit
  •3: repeat of affirmation:
    (131): yeah

(132): he’s a Capricorn\(^6\)
statement proper:
(135): Capricorn and Sagittarius
(136): that’s always bad
(138): but my sister is Capricorn and we get along splendidly\(^7\)

••2: the other signs are good:
  (140): but all the other signs
  (141): like the moon sign, the ascendant and all that, came out good

••3: explanation:\(^8\)
  (143): I-mean it matched perfectly
  (145): we fell into the best category
INCIDENTAL QUERY
M1: Ga's unfinished request for information: 9
   (146): how did you get out of him the date and time of his birth
   (147): without/
M2: Ge's response 10
   •1: answer proper (reported conversation with Jack):
      (148): I told him:
      (149): "hey I could do your chart" + laughter
   •2: elaboration (explanation): 11
      (150): he 's into that I-Ching thing
      (151): and I said: "I never really explored I-Ching but I can do astrology a little bit
      (153): very basic astrology"
      •2: elaboration (explanation): 11
      (154): "I-mean if you want real astrology
      (155): you're going to have to pay somebody"

Respondent's account:
-fn1
Ge finally changes the subject to a more removed one but is still about Jack
makes a statement
Ge cuts off Ga completely to show that she does not want her advice
at this point Ge is in more control of the conversation
while still discussing Jack it has become non-personal
her tone of voice increases
and she is becoming more confident in what she says
Ge is more at ease
can talk about Jack on a non-personal level
both Ge and Ga become more confident and more at ease
tone of voice becomes louder
removed activity
more technical
abstract
more comfortable
Ge is still expressing feeling but general not personal
kind-of a joke (= the charts) (116)
-fn2
Ge apologizes for being dingbat-like (118)+(120-121)
-fn3
Ge goes on to describe how the charts came out (122-124)
difference of understanding between Ge and Ga
clarifying understanding
Ge views astrology as a disclaimer
Ge checking Ga's understanding if she's following her
how far she can go with topic (127-128)

Ga reassures Ge's disclaimer (129-131)

Ge feeling that something will eventually go wrong in the relationship
she tries to make a joke out of it

she tries to use the relationship with her sister to put her fears into perspective

Ge elaborating on why chart was good
beneath it all Ge is expressing still her uncertainty about Jack
feeling of uncertainty (line 136)
she is aware that astrology is not the most reliable source but it still is used as another way to back up her feeling
that something will eventually go wrong in the relationship
she tries to make a joke out of it but then she tries to use her successful relationship with her sister who is also a
Capricorn to put into perspective her fears (132-145)

Ga asks a question (146)
Ge interrupts question and answers it (148-153)
Ge elaborates on question (154-155)
VF SECTION (156-187)

(1) RECAPITULATION
a) Analytic Specification of Section:

### Defining Criteria for Verbal Flow:
**Type of Talk:** SHOOTING THE BREEZE  
**Modality of Talk:** displaced  
**Focality:** focal  
**Segmentation Criterion for VF Section (156-187):**
- **topic:** Ed's heritage

b) Transcript of Talk in Section:

Ga (156): well  
(157): I know where Ed was born  
(158): he was born in Poland  
Ge (159): wow!  
Ga (160): yeah  
Ge (161): you-mean you never got the story about how the Haitian got to Poland?  
Ga (162): no  
(163): that's what I'm trying to figure out how?  
Ge (164): Poland  
(165): isn't that one of the iron blocks?  
Ga (166): I-mean there were Communists then!  
Ge (167): yeah  
Ga (168): how could they have met?  
Ge (169): wow!  
Ga (170): that's what I don't understand  
(171): unless  
(172): I-mean ya-know [if]  
(173): if he had a relative in the army but  
(174): how could they be in Poland when it was still Communist?  
(175): I just don't understand how a Haitian and Polish person could have met  
Ge (176): maybe it was really something  
(177): really neat like they were diplomats or-something  
Ga (178): yeah  
(179): something really funky like that  
Ge (180): yeah  
Ga (181): I know his dad ...  
(182): his parents are really well educated  
(183): something like one has a PhD or-something-like-that  
Ge (184): uh-huh  
Ga (185): maybe it was something like that  
(186): but definitely something really funky  
Ge (187): yeah
(2) BASIC UNITS:

There are two basic units, as follows:
(1) VF SubStretch (156-160) is an INFORMING, specified by the semantic schema: Ga tells Ge about Ed's birthplace.
(2) VF SubStretch (161-187) is a RITUAL BANTER, specified by the semantic schema: Ge and GA discuss Ed's unusual heritage.
(3.1) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INFORMING (156-160)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INFORMING:
The INFORMING has a nucleus and one satellite. The nucleus has an entry and a core. The entry is a back channel dyad initiated by Ge. The core is a univox by Ga and addressed to Ge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ga (156): well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE : Ga (157-158)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACK CHANNEL (dyad)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (159): wow!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (160): yeah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORE:

Ga informing Ge

•1: preparation:
  (157): I know where Ed was born

•2: informing proper
  (158): he was born in Poland

Respondent's account:

-fn1
Ge didn't want to talk about Jack anymore
Ga noticed this and wanted to change topic and refocusses back to Ed
Ga is willing to talk about Ed
Ge felt relieved from talking about Jack
more comfortable listening than speaking
give-and-take relationship in this section
exploratory (156)

Ga referring to area of Ed's heritage
referring to old conversation: Ga wants Ge to do (Ed's) natal chart on some later date
checking back with each other (157-158)
(3.2) DETAILED ANALYSIS OF RITUAL BANTER (161-187)

a) INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF RITUAL BANTER:

The RITUAL BANTER has a nucleus and 5 satellites. The nucleus has an entry and a core. The entry is a univox by Ge. The core is multilogic, a duo initiated by Ge and taken up by Ga, with 3 rounds. The 5 satellites are univocal back channels by Ge.
**ENTRY**: Ge (161): you-mean

- **R1**: D1: Ge(161)
  - D2: Ga (162-163)

- **R2**: D1: Ge (164-165)
  - D2: Ga (166)

- **R3**: D1: Ge (176-177)
  - D2: Ga (178-179)

**Back Channels**
- Ge (167): yeah
- Ge (169): wow!
- Ge (168)
- Ge (170-175)
- Ge (161): yeah
- Ge (180): yeah
- Ge (184): uh-huh
- Ge (185-186)
- Ge (187): yeah
b) RHETORICAL ORGANIZATION OF CORES:

R1:
D1: Ge's initial formulation of mystery (in format of question)\(^1\)
   (161): you never got the story about how the Haitian got to Poland?\(^1\)

D2: Ga's response proper (negation):\(^2\)
   (162): no

   **REFRAIN 1**
   Ga (163): that's what I'm trying to figure out, how?

R2:
D1: Ge specification of mystery
   (164): Poland
   (165): isn't that one of the iron blocs?

D2: Ga's contribution
•1: reformulation of mystery:
   (166): I-mean there were Communists then!
   (168): how could they have met?

   **REFRAIN 1**
   Ga (170): that's what I don't understand

•2: hypothetical solution:
   (171): unless
   (172): I-mean ya-know [if]
   (173): if he had a relative in the army

   **REFRAIN 1**
   Ga (174): but how could they be in Poland when it was still Communist?
   (175): I just don't understand how a Haitian and Polish person could have met
R3:
D1: Ge's offering her hypothesis
   (176): maybe it was [really] something
   (177): really neat like they were diplomats or-something

D2: Ga's acceptance of hypothesis (through supportive evidence)
   (178): yeah

**REFRAIN 2**
Ga (179): something really funky like that

•1: preparation of supportive evidence:
   (181): I know his dad...

•2: supportive evidence proper:
   (182): his parents are really well educated
   (183): something like one has a PhD or-something-like-that

**REFRAIN 2**
Ga (185): maybe it was something like that
   (186): but definitely something really funky

**Respondent's account**
-fn1
trying to speculate on something we don't know: me and Ga are trying to figure out since Ed is half Polish and half Haitian how a Polack and Haitian got together, you-know, how they met (161-187)

Ge and Ga are theorizing/hypothesizing about Ed's heritage
agreement of how it's an unusual situation/heritage (164-187)
-fn1'
Ge asking Ga a question
questioning what she just said )161)
-fn2
Ga answers question (162-163)
III. INTERACTION CLIMATE

I. INTERACTIVE MODE

(1) THE SUPPORT STRATEGY

For Ge the purpose of conversation between friends is mutual support
we use conversation as support or to find support
Supporting each other is a sign of friendship
you do it with people you like to be friends with
or are friends with already
It is a way of promoting friendship
it opens the door
it's a way to be known and to know about someone
it's a sense of community and friendship
We give each other support by sitting together
talking in a quiet place where you can hear each other
Support occurs everywhere in the specimen
we never disagree with each other
at the beginning it especially stands out

Ge emphasizes the importance of being a good listener
I'm more of a listener than a talker
I tend to gravitate towards people who talk more but who also listen well
I'm curious about what other people have to asay
I like taking something in

Support entails two aspects, acceptability and confirmation.
Acceptability means that anything said isn't going to be laughed at.
Confirmation is a way of asking "am I normal?" and "do other people like me?"
Giving support confirms "normalness"
It's like perception checking
ya-know you experience something
and you want to run it to someone to see if it's normal
checking for instance: "this is how I feel, is it how you feel?"
we go through a lot of the same experiences
that's what we usually talk about

As explained by Ge the support strategy is enacted through 3 techniques: (1) 
lightening up the conversation; (2) showing empathy; and (3) playing detective.

(1) Lightening up the conversation through either laughter or joking:
Laughter is used by both Ga (lines 4, 21, 62, 75 and 119) and Ge (lines 10, 14, 15,
35, and 149).
Joking is used exclusively by Ge three times in the specimen: (lines 10-15. 27-35 and
161).
As stated by the student researcher "jokes consist of catchy one-liners to make a point
and play the role of the comedienne for comic relief."
"Ga is constantly exploring serious issues...". When "at some points the conversation
becomes heavy both welcome Ge's humor."
Thus "in the first scene Ga's insecurity really emerges... Ga is self-deprecating by putting herself down. Ge senses that Ga is bothered by this and kicks in with her jokes which show support and reassurance."

(2) Showing empathy is the most prominent technique used by both Ga and Ge. This is explained by the student researcher as follows: "While making light of the conversation is sometimes appropriate, Ga is so upset that Ge must be careful to not appear that she does not understand the seriousness of what Ga is saying."
Showing empathy is done as follows:
the way we sit leaning toward each other
we listen intently and try to understand what the other person is saying
we use words such as yeah, uh-huh
also we latch onto what each other is saying
bouncing off each other
asking questions
some of it is reassuring

(3) Playing Detective is what Ga and Ge do at the end of the specimen when they piece together the story behind Ed's heritage:
"By the end of the conversation both have been drained by discussing uncomfortable subjects. The need to bond is there but in a different way. Ga and Ge are ready to drift to a topic where both can fully participate... Through mutual discovery a closeness is experienced."

(2) PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS:
Ge alternates between being close to Ga and distancing from her. There are times when Ge is either uncomfortable with what is being talked about, or uninterested because she is not asked by Ga to play her supportive role (lines 48-76).
At those times she tries to change the topic either directly by introducing a new topic herself (line 48), or indirectly by cueing Ga to change the topic by giving short answers, limited information (lines 48-99), or by using fillers such as 'ehh', 'uhhu', 'oh really'.

(3) INTERACTIVE TONE:
less confident/more confident

II. REACTIVE MODE
PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES:
uncomfortable (77-105)
feeling vulnerable
frustrated
flustered (106-115)
DATA FROM RESPONDENT'S ACCOUNT PERTAINING TO INTERACTION CLIMATE

VF SECTION (1-35)

INTERACTIVE MODE
(1) SUPPORT STRATEGY:

-lightening up
Ge feels compelled to lighten up (10) + (4-15)
making a joke (29)

- empathy is main theme (14-15):
  Ga's insecurity really sticks out here
  Ga is indirectly asking Ge for reassurance
  Ge shows that it's ok to feel that way
  reassurance
  I guess I'm just agreeing with her and kinda empathizing with her (24-35)
  empathizing, agreement (24-28)

(2) INTERACTION TONE:
light-hearted, spirited way

VF SECTION (36-47)

INTERACTIVE MODE
PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS: distancing
Ge did not feel that she had a part in it
her role is out on hold
not interested
not supportive
bitchy

VF SECTION (48-76)

PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS: distancing
Ge is tired of topic
Ge asks Ga a question to change topic
doesn't want to appear rude
hopes through her cueing that Ga will realize
Ge isn't interested because Ga isn't playing the role of seeking reassurance
VF SECTION (77-105)

**REACTIVE MODE**
**PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES:**
Ge is uncomfortable
awkwardness and ambivalence
ambiguity/confusion: wants and doesn't want to talk about Jack
doesn't intend to reveal her true feelings

VF SECTION (106-115)

**REACTIVE MODE**
**PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES:**
Ge feels vulnerable when talking about her feelings
frustrated by Ga not responding to her cues to change topic
flustered by Ga's advice which she feels is unwanted

VF SECTION (116-155)

**REACTIVE MODE**
**PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES:**
Ge in more control of the conversation
more confident in what she says
more at ease
both Ge and Ga become more confident and more at ease
beneath it Ge is expressing still her uncertainty about Jack

VF ECTION (161-187)

**I. INTERACTIVE MODE**
**PARTICIPANT ALIGNMENTS:**
give and take relationship in this section

**II. REACTIVE MODE**
**PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES:**
Ge more comfortable listening than speaking
Ge felt relieved from talking about Jack
3C: COMPARISON
INTRODUCTION

The goal of the comparison is to ascertain the similarities and differences in the way Ga and Ge perceive the interaction taking place between them in the specimen and explore their significance for the understanding of interaction.

The comparison is performed in two contexts: (1) the specimen as a whole; (2) portions of the specimen called comparison units.
I. THE SPECIMEN AS A WHOLE

In this context, the two versions are compared on the basis of the respondents' segmentation of the specimen into major parts.

In Ga's version, the segmentation is done on the basis of two notions: Spotlight, whether it is Ga or Ge who has the spotlight, and Focus, whether it is Ed or Jack (the girls' boyfriends) who is the focus of their conversation. This yields three Parts displaying an alternation of Spotlight/Focus, as follows:

| Part I: Focus on Ga / Spotlight on Ed (1-76) |
| Part II: Focus on Ge/ Spotlight on Jack (77-155) |
| Part III: Focus on Ga again/ Spotlight on Ed again (156-187) |

In Ge's version, the segmentation is done on the basis of changes in the level of tension arising from the topics being pursued. This also yields three Parts displaying a downward progression of levels of tension, as follows:

| Part I: High tension topics (1-115) |
| Part II: Ga and I move to a more lighthearted theme (116-155) |
| Part III: Both Ga and I are more confident -- Resolution is achieved (156-187) |

In the two versions, the boundaries between the main parts correspond to a change in the principle of organization used by the respondent: a change in focus/spotlight, in Ga's version; a change in tension level in Ge's version. Since this change does not always occur in the same place in the two versions, the three main parts do not always correspond to one another.

The segmentation of the specimen into main parts in the two versions is displayed in the following Table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ga's version</th>
<th>Ge's version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I: Spotlight on Ga/Focus on Ed (1-76)</td>
<td>Part I: High tension topics (1-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II: Spotlight on Ge/Focus on Jack (77-155)</td>
<td>Part II: Ga and I move to a more lighthearted theme (116-155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III: Spotlight on Ga/Focus on Ed again (156-187)</td>
<td>Part III: Both Ga and I are more confident - Resolution is achieved (156-187)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In both versions the overall segmentation of the specimen is done on the basis of preocupations pertaining to the Interaction Climate, i.e. the participants' subjective view of the interaction. These preocupations are divergent:

Ga is nurturing her friendship to Ge by making sure that she does not feel left out but participates equally in the conversation. Ga has a technique-oriented approach to friendship (see her Recollection: I want to be her friend, build the relationship). That is why alternating who has the spotlight is important for her.

Ge is interested in creating the right atmosphere for bonding. She has a feeling-oriented approach to friendship. That is why the tone of the interaction, whether tense or relaxed, is so important to her.
II. COMPARISON UNITS WITHIN THE SPECIMEN

They include individual sections or groups of sections that have the same boundaries in the two versions. There are 7 Comparison Units in the Specimen, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Unit 1 (1-35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Unit 2 (36-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Unit 3 (48-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Unit 4 (76-105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Unit 5 (106-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Unit 6 (116-155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Unit 7 (156-187)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The goal of the comparison within each of these units is to investigate the relation between the subjective and objective views that the two participants --acting as respondents-- have of the interaction taking place. This is done by ascertaining the similarities and differences in the Interaction Climate (the subjective view, as per the respondents' accounts) and how these are manifested in the basic units of the Verbal Flow Structure (the objective view, as per the analyst informed by the respondent's accounts).

In line with the above, the format for the presentation of the comparison within each Comparison Unit, is as follows:

A: Transcript of Talk in Comparison Unit
B: Ascertaining the manifestations of the Interaction Climate in the Basic Units:
   1: Comparing Interaction Climate in the two versions
   2: Comparing the Basic Units (inventory and internal structure) in the two versions

In what follows the 7 Comparison Units are examined in turn.
COMPARISON UNIT 1 (1-35)
A: The Transcript of the Talk is as follows:

Ga (1): It's funny sometimes I dress up in like blue and black
(2): like ya-know the alternative crowd
(3): I look in the mirror
(4): I don't look alternative at all (*laughter*)
(5): like I just can't/
(6): just doesn't happen
(7): with my face or my hair
Ge (8): yeah
(9): ya-know
Ge (10): you've got that sweet Catholic look there (*laughter*)
Ga (11): no matter where I go
Ge (12): uh-huh
(13): but that's just cool
(14): sweet Catholic girl alternative (*laughter*)
(15): rockin' Catholic girl (*laughter*)
Ga (16): it's totally messed up ya-know
Ge (17): shit!
Ga (18): that's funny I guess
(19): ya-know
(20): I didn't even go to Catholic school
(21): when I say that people go "really!? " (*laughter*)
(22): they expect I was raised by nuns or-something
(23): like I'm really not like... ya-know
Ge (24): I used to hate that too
(25): because I kinda have that same quality
Ga (26): uh-huh
Ge (27): but as I got older
(28): it's better
(29): I'd rather look like that than a rat
(30): ya-know
Ga (31): uh-huh
(32): it's true
Ge (33): not that
(34): ya-know
(35): the only alternative to Catholic is a rat (*laughter*)

[pause]
B: Ascertaining the manifestations of the Interaction Climate in the Basic Units

1: Comparing the Interaction Climate in the 2 versions:
Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit are divergent.
--Ga is managing her anxiety. She is creating, with Ge's help, a "comfort zone" that will allow her to talk freely, in the next section, about what she is obsessing about at the moment: having talked about her boyfriend Ed to her co-workers. (The exchange of history ... opens up a comfort space...to ...feel comfortable to talk about Ed again).
--Ge is engaging in bonding. For Ge the purpose of conversation between friends is mutual support (we use conversation as support or to find support).

2: Comparing the Basic Units in the 2 versions:
The inventory of the basic units and their internal structure are different in the 2 versions.
--Ga organizes the information on the basis of two layers, a superficial layer and a deeper layer.
The superficial layer is organized in terms of two topics: the vampire image and the sweet Catholic girl image.
The deeper layer is organized in terms of three anxiety reduction techniques that utilize the two images. This yields three basic units: VF Stretch (1-39), VF Substretch (10-17) and VF Substretch (18-35).
In VF Stretch (1-9), Ga tells a funny narrative (a narrative story illustrating how I feel when I try to look alternative...can you imagine me in a club with my vampire look).
The two substretches relate to the sweet Catholic girl image, as follows:
In VF Substretch (10-17), Ge co-creates with Ga the image of Ga as a sweet Catholic girl.
Co-imaging is a "strategy for achieving a feeling of closeness. Division of labor between Ga and Ge. Ga is the straight man. She sets up the scene using a narrative. Ge responds with a summary quip that achieves much laughter."
In VF Substretch (18-35), Ge is paralleling: she tells Ga that she too looks like a sweet Catholic girl, which reassures Ga (so we have this thing in common...she's been perceived in the same way too...she reassured me emotionally).
--Ge organizes the information on the basis of a sequence of two occurrences: Ga showing her insecurity over her appearance (Ga is talking about how she would like to be more alternative and less traditional...Ga's insecurity sticks out here, and Ge consoling her); then Ge reassuring her.
This sequence is repeated in two basic units, VF Stretch (1-17) and VF Stretch (18-35). In both VF Stretch (1-17) and VF Stretch (18-35), Ge first notices Ga's anxiety and then reassures her. In order to reassure Ga, Ge uses two bonding techniques: empathy ("showing understanding", lines 8-15; "sharing similar experience", lines 24-28); and lightening up through laughter and joking ("one-liners", lines 29 and 33-35). "Ga's insecurity emerges. Ge sense that Ga is bothered and kiks in with her jokes which show support and reassurance indirectly".

The inventory of the basic units in the 2 versions is shown in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ga's version</th>
<th>Ge's version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stretch (1-9)</td>
<td>Stretch (1-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubStretch (10-17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubStretch (18-35)</td>
<td>Stretch (18-35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The internal structure of these units displays similarities and differences in keeping with the above:
--In Ga's version, the three anxiety reduction techniques correspond to three basic units with the following cores in their respective Nuclei: a univox by Ga for the funny narrative technique; a univox by Ge, with a co-construction by Ga, for the co-imaging technique; and a duo by Ga and Ge for the paralleling technique.
--In Ge's version, both basic units have the same core in their respective Nuclei: a duo by Ga and Ge.

The two univox cores in the Nuclei of VF Stretch (1-9) and Substretch (10-17) in Ga's version correspond to the single core with duo in the Nucleus of VF Stretch (1-17) in Ge's version. The cores in the Nuclei of
VF Substretch (18-35) in Ga's version and stretch (18-35) in Ge's version, are identical: a duo in each version.

The internal structure of these units is shown in the following Table:
In summary: The divergence in Ga's and Ge's view of what's really going on in this comparison unit is manifested in three ways: (1) the inventory and types of the basic units (2 basic units in Ge's version versus 3 basic units in Ga's version; only VF Stretches in Ge's version versus 1 VF Stretch and 2 VF Substretches in Ga's version); (2) the structural status of the cores in the Nuclei (2 univox cores Ga's version versus 1 duo core in Ge's version); and (3) the interpretation of the information present in these units (anxiety reduction techniques in Ga's version versus bonding techniques in Ge's version).
COMPARISON UNITS 2 (36-47)

A: The transcript of the Talk in Comparison Unit 2 is as follows:

| Ga (36): | but I was talking about it last night to like two people at work |
| (37): | and I'm like/ |
| (38): | --oh |
| (39): | I'm really cursing it now!-- |
| (40): | I'm like/ |
| Ge (41): | uh-huh |
| Ga (42): | it's just I kept it/ |
| (43): | kept it coming out |
| (44): | I'm just like: |
| (45): | "shouldn't talk about it so much" |
| (46): | but |
| (47): | anyway... |

B: Ascertaining the manifestations of the Interaction Climate in the Basic Units

1: Comparing the Interaction Climate in the 2 versions:

Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit are divergent.
--Ga feels that Ge is totally in tune with her when she expresses her anxiety over having talked about Ed to her co-workers. At one point, however, she wonders whether she should not stop.
--Ge feels that Ga is talking about people she does not know and that she has nothing to contribute. She wants to change topic ("Ge is not interested in the conversation and in fact she is not supportive at all and even bitchy").

2: Comparing the Basic Units in the 2 versions:
The inventory of the basic units is identical in the 2 versions: There is a single basic unit in each version, VF Stretch (36-47). It conveys the same topic in the 2 versions: Ga reports talking to her co-workers about Ed. The internal structure of this unit is different in the 2 versions, as shown in the following Table:
There are two differences in the 2 versions:
(1) In Ga's version, the Nucleus has an exit by Ga whereas there is none in Ge's version. At lines 46-47 Ga does not finish her thought. She trails off.
(I trail off meaning we don't have to talk about this if you don't want to.
I don't want you to bring someone else into my pain.
I stop myself here.
I'm backing out.
I'm getting depressed and anxious and I don't want to burden Ge with my pain.
I don't know if she wants to keep talking about this so I pause and see).
Ge, although she is intent on changing topic, does not understand Ga's intention. She feels that Ga's hesitation is just what it appears to be, an unfinished thought.

(2) The back channel by Ge, "huhuh", line 41, is interpreted differently by the two participants:
--For Ge it is a discrete clue that she wants to change topic (it's a "half hearted 'uh huh' that remains unnoticed"... "Ga doesn't pick on it").
--For Ga it is an encouragement (it's significant to me that she acknowledges what I'm saying and is listening).
In summary: The divergence in Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit is manifested in two ways: 
(1) the presence versus absence of a structural element, an exit; and 
(2) the antithetical interpretation of the information conveyed by another structural element, a back channel (Ge means it as discouraging Ga from going on with this topic whereas Ga understands it as encouraging her to go on with this topic).
A: The Transcript of the Talk in Comparison Unit 3, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ge (48):</td>
<td>what were they saying about it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (49):</td>
<td>they're like &quot;oh it's so cool&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50):</td>
<td>they're like/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (51):</td>
<td>and half of them are going to be at the Tropic after work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52):</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (53):</td>
<td>oh really?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (54):</td>
<td>it's going to be really weird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (55):</td>
<td>is it that Mike-guy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (56):</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57):</td>
<td>Mike and Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58):</td>
<td>I didn't see Mike but Mike'll probably be in to-morrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59):</td>
<td>but Angela will be there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (60):</td>
<td>she's not the one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61):</td>
<td>&quot;hey! I gotta know your business&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (62):</td>
<td>(laughter) no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63):</td>
<td>she's not the Latino woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64):</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65):</td>
<td>she's the supervisor there but she's just like two years older than me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (66):</td>
<td>uh-huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (67):</td>
<td>has she got the attitude or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (68):</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(69):</td>
<td>she's like totally rebel supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70):</td>
<td>she doesn't really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(71):</td>
<td>tell us what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(72):</td>
<td>one time she's like &quot;come on guys, quiet down!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(73):</td>
<td>we all started laughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(74):</td>
<td>she's behind a little cubicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75):</td>
<td>she's like: &quot;they're laughing at me&quot; (laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76):</td>
<td>it was funny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B: Ascertaining the manifestations of the Interactional Climate in the Basic Units

1: Comparing the Interaction Climate in the 2 versions:

Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit are **divergent**.
--Ge is tired of the topic and wants to change it.
--Ga feels that Ge is totally supportive.

2: Comparing the Basic Units in the 2 versions:

Both the inventory of the basic units and their internal structure are **different** in the 2 versions.
- In Ga's version, there is a single basic unit, VF Stretch(48-76). Ga sees Ge's questions about her co-workers as constituting a single set.
- In Ge's version, there are two basic units, VF Stretch (48-59) and VF Stretch (60-76). Ge distinguishes two sets of questions on a par with each other, one about Ga's co-workers in general, VF Stretch (48-59), the other about one specific co-worker, Angela, VF Stretch (60-76).

The inventory of the basic units is shown in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ga's version</th>
<th>Ge's version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stretch (48-76)</td>
<td>Stretch (48-59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stretch (60-76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The internal structure of the basic units displays similarities and differences, as shown in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ga's version</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49-52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCIDENTAL QUERY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga (56-59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (60-61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga (62-65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga (68-76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ge's version</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49-52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCIDENTAL QUERY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga (56-59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (60-61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga (62-65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ge (67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ga (68-76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three differences:
(1) In Ga's version, the single unit (VF Stretch (48-76)) has an Incidental Query with 3 exchanges.
In Ge's version, the first exchange (Lines 55-59) is also part of an Incidental Query in one unit, VF Stretch (48-59). The second and third exchanges are part of the Nucleus in another unit, VF Stretch (60-76). The rest of the internal structure is identical in the 2 versions.
(2) As in the preceding comparison unit, her back channel, "oh really?!", line 53, shows disinterest in pursuing the topic of her telling her co-workers about Ed ("she does not ask Ga to explain further"). And again it is misunderstood by Ga who interprets it as supportive.

(3) Ge, "not really wanting to know", asks a series of "technical questions", in an "attempt to send her off on another topic." Here again Ga "does not pick up on it". Ge's question, line 48, snapped me out of my feelings that Ge might not want to listen to her pain.

(she validates my feelings and tells me by her question that it's OK to keep talking about it =her anxiety).

In summary: The divergence in Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit is manifested in three ways: (1) the inventory of basic units (1 basic unit in Ga's version versus 2 basic units, in Ge's version); (2) the organization of their internal structure (Incidental Query with 3 exchanges in Ga's version versus Incidental Query with 1 exchange, the other exchanges being the core of the Nucleus of another unit, in Ge's version); and (3) the antithetical interpretation of two structural elements, a back channel and questions (Ge means them as discouraging Ga from going on with the topic whereas Ga understands them as encouraging her to pursue the topic).
COMPARISON UNIT 4 (77-105)

A: The transcript of the Talk is as follows:

| Ga (77): | so I didn't know you had a new date with uh/ |
| Ge (78): | Jack |
| Ga (79): | where you gonna go? |
| Ge (80): | uh |
|       | (81): we just left it at/ |
|       | (82): well we decided the general place we're gonna go |
|       | (83): we're gonna go meet for a drink |
|       | (84): but then we said/ |
|       | (85): we said we'll do an idea generation |
|       | (86): ya-know think about which place/ |
| Ga (87): | ok |
| Ge (88): | we're just like going to meet minds again on Wednesday |
| Ga (89): | that's great! |
| Ga (90): | where you gonna meet |
|       | (91): do you know? |
|       | (92): Joe's? |
| Ge (93): | no |
|       | (94): we just have to meet |
|       | (95): that's what we're thinking about |
| Ga (96): | oh ok |
| Ge (97): | that's where we're gonna meet |
| Ga (98): | I thought you were going to meet somewhere and then figure out |
|       | (99): where you're gonna go |
| Ge (100): | uh-huh |
|       | (101): that's the idea |
| Ga (102): | for dinner? |
|       | (103): ya-know? |
| Ge (104): | yeah |
| Ga (105): | and for a little drink and then ... |
B: Ascertaining the manifestation of the Interaction Climate in the basic units

1: Comparing the Interaction Climate in the 2 versions:

Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit are divergent:
-- For Ga it is the beginning of serious. Also it is part of sharing the spotlight (until the end of comparative unit 6, line 156).
Ga thinks that Ge is shy and unsure that she (Ga) is willing to listen to her talking about her feelings for her boyfriend (sometimes I'm afraid someone doesn't want to listen and she 's doing that too).
-- Ge is not shy. She is just not ready to talk about Jack. She wants to think about it first. Ga does not pick up on her clues and that "frustrates her". She feels that Ga is pushy ("Ga keeps plugging away anyway").

2: Comparing the Basic Units in the 2 versions:

Both the inventory of the basic units and their internal structure are identical in the 2 versions.
There are two basic units in each version, VF SubStretch (77-89), and VF SubStretch (90-105).
-- VF Substretch (77-89) conveys the topic: Ga asks Ge what she is going to do on her date with Jack.

The internal structure of this unit is shown in the following Table:
There is one difference in the interpretation by the two participants:
--Ge, lines 80-88, talks very softly and unclearly on purpose, as a clue to Ga that she wants to change topic ("Ge did not intend to show her true feelings. Her voice becomes much softer and is choppy and hard to follow. There is both ambiguity and confusion on Ge's part...Ge's tone of voice became softer she does not want to be heard."
Ge does not feel at ease when the spotlight is on her. She would rather be an intent listener playing her supportive role. 
--Ga, not understanding her answer to her question, asks her question again as a form of repair.
VF Substretch (90-105) conveys the topic: Ga asks Ge again what she is going to do on her date. The internal structure of this unit is shown in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ga (90-92)</td>
<td>[Diagram showing M1: Ga (90-92)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ge (93-95)</td>
<td>[Diagram showing M2: Ge (93-95)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Channel</td>
<td>[Diagram showing Back Channel]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (96)</td>
<td>[Diagram showing Ga (96): oh ok]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: Ga (98-99)</td>
<td>[Diagram showing M1: Ga (98-99)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Ge (100-101)</td>
<td>[Diagram showing M2: Ge (100-101)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Channel</td>
<td>[Diagram showing Back Channel (dyad)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (103)</td>
<td>[Diagram showing Ga (103): ya-know]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (104)</td>
<td>[Diagram showing Ge (104): yeah]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two differences in the interpretation by the two participants:
1. Lines 100-101, "Ge tries to change topic through giving short, confirming answers". Ga does not understand her clue.
2. In the back channel, Line 104, "Ge answers 'yeah' showing she is still part of the conversation but does not want to talk further." Here again Ga does not understand her clue. She is "still plugging away."
In summary: The divergence in Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit is manifested in two ways: (1) unclear substance (Ge means it as a clue that she wants to change topic whereas Ga understands it as a need for repair); (2) antithetical interpretation of a structural element, a back channel (Ge means it as discouraging Ga from going on with the topic whereas Ga understands it as encouraging her to pursue it).
COMPARISON UNIT 5 (106-115)

A: The transcript of the Talk is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ge (106):</td>
<td>I don't know Gabrielle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(107):</td>
<td>it's going ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(108):</td>
<td>he's really easy to talk to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(109):</td>
<td>which is rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (110):</td>
<td>that's cool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ge (111):</td>
<td>for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112):</td>
<td>the most/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(113):</td>
<td>I-guess/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (114):</td>
<td>and I-guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115):</td>
<td>don't analyze it ya-know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: Ascertaining the manifestations of the Interaction Climate in the Basic Units

1: Comparing the Interaction Climate in the 2 versions:

Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit are divergent:
--Ge feels that Ga really wants to know so she decides to talk ("she feels compelled to finally discuss her feelings for Jack...to give her a taste of how things are going...just kinda telling Ga that things are going well so far). But she is not happy to do so. She feels that it makes her vulnerable ("she doesn't like talking about things of this nature. She is an introvert who keeps her feelings to herself most of the time").
--Ga is projecting her own anxiety over relationships unto Ge. She assumes that Ge is anxious over her relationship with Jack just as she is over her relationship with Ed (this is very serious, like this is scary). So she procedes to give Ge the advice not to do what she herself does all the time, overanalyze (lines 114-115).

2: Comparing the Basic Units in the 2 versions:

Both the inventory of the basic units and their internal structure are identical in the 2 versions.
There is a single basic unit in each version, VF Stretch (106-115).
It conveys the topic: Ge finally decides to talk about her relationship with Jack.

The internal structure of this unit is shown in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ge (106): I don't know, Gabrielle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE: Ge (107-109)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(111-113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Channel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga (110): that's cool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry: Ga (114): and I guess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core: Ga (115)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is one difference in the interpretation by the two participants: -Here again Ge tries to give Ga cues that she wants to change the topic ("her voice remains quite soft because she doesn't want to be heard". Lines111-113 "she is intensionally expressing hesitation". --Ga while being supportive, again does not pick up on her cues and this greatly frustrates Ge.

In summary: The divergence in Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit is manifested in one way: the different interpretation of the unclear substance (Ge means it as a clue to change topic whereas Ga understands it as a show of anxiety on Ge's part).
Comparison Unit 6 (116-155)

A: The Transcript of the talk is as follows:

Ge (116): I did the charts
Ga (117): you did!?!
Ge (118): kind-of embarrassed to admit it
Ga (119): that's cool (laughter)
Ge (120): but I did the charts
Ga (121): that's cool
Ge (122): they came out really good
   (123): they did
   (124): I'm surprised
Ga (125): wow!
Ge (126): because well
   (127): you know a little bit about astrology
   (128): right?
Ga (129): yeah
   (130): a teeny bit
   (131): yeah
Ge (132): he's a Capricorn
Ga (133): oh no!
   (134): a Capricorn!
Ge (135): Capricorn and Sagittarius
   (136): that's always bad
Ga (137): yeah
Ge (138): but my sister is Capricorn and we get along splendidly
Ga (139): uh-huh
Ge (140): but all the other signs
   (141): like the moon sign, the ascendent and all that, came out good
Ga (142): that's cool
Ge (143): I-mean it matched up perfectly
Ga (144): that's great
Ge (145): we fell into the best category
Ga (146): so how did you get out of him the date and time of his birth
   (147): without/
Ge (148): I told him
   (149): "hey I could do your chart" (laughter)
   (150): --well ya-know he's into that 'I Ching' stuff--
   (151): and I said: "I never really explored 'I Ching'"
   (152): but I can do astrology a little bit
   (153): very basic astrology
   (154): I-mean if you want real astrology
   (155): you're going to have to pay somebody"
B: Ascertaining the manifestations of The Interaction Climate int the Basic Units

1: Comparing the Interaction Climate in the 2 versions:

Ga's and Ge's views of what's going on in this comparison unit are **divergent**:

--Ga is still projecting her anxiety over relationships unto Ge. She thinks that Ge is still upset (we're talking about something deep. we're talking about relationships. this segment is serious).

--Ge is relieved because she is now talking about Jack in an impersonal way, her doing his astrological charts, rather than talking about how she feels about him. She can concentrate on her friendship with Ga, creating a good climate in which to relate to her.

2: Comparing the Basic Units in the 2 versions:

Both the inventory of the basic units and their internal structure are **identical** in the 2 versions.

There is a single basic unit in each version, Stretch (116-155). It conveys the topic: Ge describes how she did Jack's astrological charts.

The internal structure of this unit is as follows:
### NUCLEUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE: Ge (116)</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>Back Channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(120)</td>
<td>Ga (117): you did!?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122-124)</td>
<td>Ga (119): that's cool!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>Ga(121): that's cool!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>Ga (125): wow!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>INCIDENTAL QUERY entry: Ge (126): well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135-136)</td>
<td>M1: Ge (127-128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>M2: Ga (129-131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(140-141)</td>
<td>Ga (133): oh no!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>(134): Capricorn!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>Ga (137): yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ga (139): uh-huh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ga (142): that's cool!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ga (144): that's great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INCIDENTAL QUERY entry: Ga (146): so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1: Ga (146-147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M2: Ge (148-155)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two differences in the interpretation by the two participants:

(1) For Ge, her statement line 116, "I did the Charts", is an abrupt change of topic to show Ga that she is not interested in her advice, lines 114-115. (Ge "is flustered by Ga's advice because it was not asked." She "cuts off Ga completely to show that she does not want her advice"). She switches to a light mode in which she uses various bonding techniques. For Ga, this statement as well as the one lines 150-151 "Jack is into IChing", are efforts on Ge's part to lighten up the conversation "putting a funny to distract". Ge talking about Jack evokes in Ga the same anxiety as when she herself was talking about Ed. She sees Ge doing the same things to reassure her as she was doing in Comparison Unit 2.

(2) For Ga, the statement line 132, "He's a Capricorn", is a sign that they are "in tune with each other". They have spoken before about the subject and don't need to spell it out. Capricorn is an unspoken thing in our conversation we're so in tune with each other she knows what I'm going to say this is part of the history that smoothes things over making yourself laugh too

For Ge, it has a different meaning:
"while discussing Jack it has become nonpersonal, Her tone of voice increases and she is becoming more confident in what she says. However, beneath it all Ge is expressing still her uncertainty about Jack. She is aware that astrology is not the most reliable source but it is used as another way to back up her feeling that something will eventually go wrong in the relationship."

In summary: The divergence in Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit is manifested in their different interpretation of what is being said:
Ga thinks that Ge is completely in tune with her. The whole unit is a diversion from her anxiety.
Ge is into her own concern, bonding with Ga.
COMPARISON UNIT 7 (156-187)

A: The transcript of the Talk is as follows:

Ga (156): well
   (157): I know where Ed was born
   (158): he was born in Poland
Ge (159): wow!
Ga (160): yeah
Ge (161): you-mean you never got the story about how the Haitian got to Poland?
Ga (162): no
   (163): that's what I'm trying to figure out how/
Ge (164): Poland
   (165): isn't that one of the iron blocks?
Ga (166): I-mean there were Communists then!
Ge (167): yeah
Ga (168): how could they have met?
Ge (169): wow!
Ga (170): that's what I don't understand
   (171): unless
   (172): I-mean ya-know if/
   (173): if he had a relative in the army
   (174): but how could they be in Poland when it was still Communist?
   (175): I just don't understand how a Haitian and Polish person could have met
Ge (176): maybe it was really something
   (177): really neat like they were diplomats or-something
Ga (178): yeah
   (179): something really funky like that
Ge (180): yeah
Ga (181): I know his dad/
   (182): his parents are really well educated
   (183): something like one has a PhD or-something-like-that
Ge (184): uh-huh
Ga (185): maybe it was something-like-that
   (186): but definitely something really funky
Ge (187): yeah
B: Ascertain the manifestations of the Interaction Climate in the Basic Units

1: Comparing the Interaction Climate in the 2 versions:
Ga's and Ge's views of what's really going on in this comparison unit are **divergent**.

-- Ga is still centered on her anxiety. Initially she is on the verge of falling prey to it. Then the conversation becomes a "diversion, a moment when she is distanced from her trouble".

-- Ge is back to bonding. Ge feels that both are relieved and that it is a give and take relationship.

2: Comparing the Basic Units:
Both the inventory of the basic units and their internal structure are **identical** in the 2 versions.
There are two basic units in each version, VF SubStretch (156-160) and VF Substretch (161-187).

-- VF Substretch (156-160) conveys the topic: Ga tells Ge where Ed was born.
The internal structure of this unit is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ga (156): well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE: Ga (157-158)</td>
<td>BACK CHANNEL (dyad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ge (159): wow!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ga (160): yeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is one difference in the interpretation by the two participants:
-- Ga's anxiety is triggered by the expression "was born". It is related to doing Ed's astrological charts which the two friends discussed in the past. For her the opening statement (line 157) could have led to serious talk and anxiety (it almost got serious when I said 'I know where Ed was born' ...I was thinking would I want to go through and have his chart done and risk being hurt).

Ge is afraid of astrology (I'm afraid of astrology because it can doom you to a type of failure).
--Ge is totally unaware of Ga's feelings. She is ready to start using her bonding technique.

--VF Substretch (161-187) conveys the topic: Ge and Ga discuss how Ed's parents met.
The internal structure of this unit is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUCLEUS</th>
<th>SATELLITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTRY: Ge (161): you-mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1: Ge (161)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: Ga (162-163)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1: Ge (164-165)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: Ga (166)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(168)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(170-175)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1: Ge (176-177)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2: Ga (178-179)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(181-183)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(185-186)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Back Channels
Ge (167): yeah
Ge (169): wow!
Ge (180): yeah
Ge (184): uh-huh
Ge (187): yeah
There is one difference in the interpretation by the two participants: 
--Ge uses one of her technique for bonding, playing detective, i.e., 
figuring out something together. "Ga and Ge drift to a topic where both 
can fully participate. Together they piece together the story behind Ed's 
heritage. Through mutual discovery a closeness is experienced." 
-- Ga accepts Ge's invitation to lighten the mood by talking about Ed's 
strange ethnicity (but Ge drew my attention to something else). For her talking about 
where Ed's parents met is a safe topic. It is light, introspective talk in which she is 
fully engaged.

In summary: The divergence in Ga's and Ge's views of what's really 
going in in this comparison unit is manifested in their different 
interpretation of what is being said: 
(1) anxiety for Ga which Ge is unaware of; (2) bonding for Ge versus 
diversion from her anxiety for Ga.
**INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS**

The comparison of the two participants' views of the interaction taking place in the Comparison Units, is surprising in two respects: (1) the extent and degree of individual variation; and (2) the fact that not only the subjective view (the interpretation of the information conveyed in the basic units), but also the objective view (the internal structure of these units), are affected by individual variation.

Thus, each one of the 7 Comparison Units displays some individual variation. And, in several cases, the two participants' views are antithetical: Ga thinks that she and Ge are totally in tune with each other when Ge is in fact totally nonsupportive.

Individual variation in the participants' subjective view is not surprising. In the comparison units, it is associated with three factors: undetected feelings, the deliberate use of ambiguous carriers and the participants' mindset.

--Occasionally one of the participants does not read the feelings of the other: Thus, Ga does not notice Ge's angry rejection of her advice (at the beginning of Comparative Unit 6); Ge does not notice that Ga is on the verge of anxiety at the idea of doing Ed's astrological charts (at the beginning of Comparative Unit 7).
--Ge, in order to be discrete, deliberately uses 3 types of ambiguous clues to convey to Ga --who does not get it-- the delicate message that she wants to change topic: back channels, short questions and unclear substance.
Back channels are ambiguous since their intended meaning varies according to the intonation which can easily be misread (see line 41, in Comparative Unit 2; line 53, in Comparative Unit 3; line 104, in Comparative Unit 4).
Short questions, especially if there are many of them, may be a sign of disinterest (see Comparative Unit 3).
Finally, Ge's soft voice and choppy delivery are hard to hear and hard to understand (see Comparative Unit 4).
--The participants' mindset acts as a filter all the way through the 7 Comparison Units: Ga sees everything as relating to her anxiety, whereas Ge is mostly interested in bonding.
Individual variation in the participants' objective view is surprising. In line with the fact that the VF Structure is understood here as shared by the participants qua members of the same culture, it was not expected that it would be affected by individual variation. The fluidity of the structure is manifested in a number of qualitative differences applying two aspects of the organization of the information: the inventory of basic units; and their internal structure.

One qualitative difference applying to the inventory of basic units has to do with differentiation: The information conveyed in a sequence of two substretches, or two stretches, is more highly differentiated than in a single stretch conveying the same information. Thus, in Comparison Unit 3, the information is more differentiated in Ge's version than in Ga's version (two basic units, VF Stretch 48-59 and VF Stretch 60-76 in Ge's version versus one basic unit, VF Stretch 48-76, in Ga's version).

Three qualitative differences applying to the internal structure of basic units, are: integration; centrality; and abruptness of termination.

--A unit containing a core with a duo is similar to a sequence of two units with a univox core in each, conveying the same information, but it is more highly integrated. Thus, in Comparison Unit 1, the single basic unit lines 1-17, in Ge's version is more highly integrated than the sequence of the two basic units lines 1-8 and 10-17, in Ga's version.

--The core in a Nucleus is similar to the core in an Incidental Query (a Satellite), conveying the same information, but it is more central. Thus, in Comparison Unit 3, lines 60-76 are more central in Ge's version than in Ga's version.

--The end of a unit, either the Nucleus or a Satellite, is less abrupt if an exit is present. Thus, in Comparison Unit 2 the end of the only basic unit, VF Stretch 36-47, is less abrupt in Ga's version than in Ge’s version.
The initial attempt to understand individual variation in the participants' view of their own interaction described in this paper, yields a promising result: The specification of individual variation brings a dynamic dimension to the analytic accounting of conversation. Thus, the participants' subjective view is no longer equated only to the Interaction Climate (mindset). It also includes the active part the participants play in the interpretation of the information present (their occasional lack of notice; their utilization of ambiguity).

The participants' objective view is no longer equated only to the VF Structure. It also includes the qualitative values achieved by some structural properties, such as the optionality of some structural elements (exit) or some structural similarities (internal structure of core of Incidental Query and core of Nucleus; duo in the core of one unit and sequence of two units with a univox core in each).

A common criticism leveled at the structural approach is that it is static. The further investigation of individual variation in the participants' view of their own interaction may remedy this shortcoming.